

# The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1901.

It is with great regret that we announce that increasing demands upon his time have obliged Mr. Cecil Smith to retire from his position as Associate Editor of this *Review*. Mr. Smith was the last of the triumvirate of scholars who assisted Prof. J. B. Mayor in piloting it through the beginning of its course, the other two being Prof. A. J. Church and Mr. A. M. Cook; and three editors in succession have had the benefit of his ready help and his skilled advice. Prof. Ernest A. Gardner, of University College, London, succeeds to the place vacated by Mr. Smith.

The scheme of the curriculum in Classics at the new University of Birmingham, which appeared in the course of this summer, presents a feature which well deserves a word of commendation. With the object of providing the Classical passman with pabulum less scrappy and unsatisfying than ordinarily falls to his share, the study of the particular Greek and Latin books prescribed is brought into connexion with that of the branch of literature to which they belong. Thus a play of Aeschylus will be studied in relation to the history of the Greek drama as a whole, a book of Virgil with due reference to the development of Roman Epic, and so on. In the words of the Prospectus: 'The University Courses are designed to embrace a study of representative masterpieces of Latin and Greek literature, which will be treated as literary wholes and from a literary point of view.'

NO. CXXXV. VOL. XV.

The three-year Course brings the student into contact with typical specimens of classical literature in the fields of Epic, Lyric, Idyllic, and Dramatic poetry, and of philosophical prose and literary criticism, and thus provides a basis for the historical and comparative study of English and other modern literatures.'

Dr. Peterson, of McGill University, Montreal, has discovered the lost *Codex Metellianus* of Cicero in a ninth century MS. of Lord Leicester's library at Holkham. A facsimile from this codex appeared some twelve or thirteen years ago in *Chatelain, Paléographie des Classiques Latins*; but otherwise nothing has been known of it till now. By deciphering an erased library mark Dr. Peterson has proved that the manuscript was once at Cluni, and is in fact the volume numbered 498 in the 'vetus catalogus bibliothecae Cluniacensis'—a catalogue compiled between the years 1157 and 1161. It would appear that the *Metellianus*, which was used by Gulielmus for the second and third books of the *Verrines*, was the same MS. as that 'codex Fabricii' which Lambinus cites in his second edition. A full collation of this important codex which contains also the *Catilines* and the *Deiotarus*, with a fragment of the *Ligarius*, with an account of its history and the proofs of its identity, is published by the Clarendon Press in the *Anecdota* series.

## ASSOCIATED REMINISCENCES.

It is notorious that a well-read writer constantly reproduces phrases that he has come across elsewhere. But it is not so often remarked that the borrowed phrase has a knack of awakening in his memory some other phrase to be found usually, though not always, in the source from which he is borrowing; and that, when this is the case, the borrower may proceed to utilise the second expression as well as the first. In other words, we are familiar with the fact that the phrase *A* in the poetaster *Y* may be a reminiscence of the phrase *A* in the poet *X*. But it is also true that, in the mind of *Y*, *A* may recall *B*, a second phrase of *X*; and that the result may appear as *A'...B'* in the works of *Y*. It must be added that the whole process is sometimes conscious, sometimes unconscious: to describe such examples of appropriation as plagiarism is to pronounce a rough and ready verdict on a case that may be extremely complicated.

If we now ask under what conditions *A* recalls *B* and thus gives rise to *A'...B'*, it is at once obvious that we are dealing with a particular application of a general law—the law of Association. Aristotle put the philosophy of the matter into a nutshell when he said τὸ ἐφεξῆς θηρούμεν νοήσαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἢ ἄλλου τινός, καὶ ἂ φ' ὁμοίου ἢ ἐναντίου ἢ τοῦ σύνεγγυς (*de mem.* 2. 451 b 18). His three methods of association, by similarity, by contrast, and by contiguity, are nowadays often reduced to two through the elimination of contrast. Thus Prof. W. James (*Principles of Psychology* i. 593) observes: 'Recent writers ...all reduce it [*sc.* contrast] either to similarity or contiguity. Contrast always presupposes generic similarity...Moreover, the greater number of contrasts are habitually coupled in speech.'<sup>1</sup> Accepting, then, the time-honoured sub-division into (1) cases of association ἀφ' ὁμοίου and (2) cases of association ἀπὸ τοῦ σύνεγγυς, I propose for clearness' sake to give some English examples of each before proceeding to discuss their classical prototypes.

(1) Those who dipped into a volume of verse published last year under the title of

*Ad Astra* may have noticed a stanza (xl.) beginning—

'O thou, who somewhere braidest billowy gold.'

The line has a familiar sound about it; and a moment's thought suffices to show that it is a conflation of two passages in the *In Memoriam*,—

'O thou that after toil and storm'  
(xxxiii.)—

and—

'O somewhere, meek, unconscious dove,  
That sittest ranging golden hair' (vi.).

Both pieces are a little altered or embellished in the patchwork; but the stuff out of which they were cut is unmistakable, and that the scissors have been used is further proved by their context. I have not, however, cited the line for the purpose of insisting on the imitation, but because it illustrates the method ἀφ' ὁμοίου. The mental process involved seems to have been as follows. The passage 'O thou that after' etc., once thought of, brought in its train the other passage 'O somewhere' etc., and both were worked into the line in question. But why did *A* bring *B* in its train? Because *B* resembled *A*, each of them being an invocation, beginning with the interjection 'O'—and continued with the relative 'that,' at the commencement of a similar Tennysonian stanza. It is not, however, necessary that *A* and *B* should be drawn from the same source. It occasionally happens that the poetaster is inspired by a couple of poets. When Kirke White in his verses on *Time* wrote—

'Far from the busy crowd's tumultuous  
din;  
From noise and wrangling far, and undisturbed  
With Mirth's unholy shouts.'

he had in mind Gray's *Elegy* of course—

'Far from the madding crowd's ignoble  
strife'—

but also Milton's *Il Penseroso*—

'Far from all resort of mirth.'

If the latter identification be doubted, compare the context in Milton with a passage that occurs some thirty lines earlier in Kirke White:

<sup>1</sup> Others, e.g. Höffding (*Outlines of Psychology*, p. 152 ff.), recognise Association of Ideas by Similarity, by External Connection (Contiguity), and by the Relation between the Whole and the Parts—the last method being intermediate between the other two and transitional in character.

## MILTON.

'Or if the air will not permit,  
Some still removed place will fit,  
Where glowing embers through the room  
Teach light to counterfeit a gloom;  
Far from all resort of mirth,  
etc.

Here, too, the minor poet had in view the same two passages: and Gray suggested Milton, or Milton suggested Gray, to his thoughts thanks to the obvious *homoiokatakraton*.

(2) Elsewhere *A'* is followed by *B'*, not because of any essential similarity between *A* and *B*, but simply because in the original source *A* was followed by *B*. Kirke White in his ode *To Contemplation* again betrays the influence of Gray. Near the beginning of it, after telling how in the early morning the zephyrs—

'Shake the dewdrops from the thorn,'

he continues—

'There, as o'er the fields we pass,  
Brushing with hasty feet the grass,'  
etc.

## MILTON.

*A* { 'I hear the far-off curfew sound,  
{ Over some wide water'd shore,  
{ Swinging slow with sullen roar.'

## GRAY.

*B* { 'The curfew tolls the knell of parting  
day,'  
(and a few lines later)  
*C* { 'Save that from yonder ivy-mantled  
tower  
{ The moping owl does to the moon  
complain.'

Kirke White's description of the curfew (*A'*) evidently derives from *Il Penseroso*: the use of the word *roar* and the similarity of *sullen* and *sullen*, not to mention the identity of metre, are decisive. Milton's description (*A*) suggested that of Gray (*B*), who after speaking of the curfew proceeds to dilate on the tower, the owl, and the moon (*C*). All three reappear in the same order in Kirke White's continuation (*C'*).

I have quoted a comparatively obvious example. Sometimes the connexion is much harder to trace: for the formula  $A + B + C = A' \dots C'$  is capable of indefinite extension and variation. Indeed the thread of thought is often quite too subtle to be

## KIRKE WHITE.

'He must waste by night  
The studious taper, far from all resort  
Of crowds and folly, in some still retreat ;'  
etc.

Already we feel that his lines are a reminiscence of the *Elegy*—

'Oft have we seen him at the peep of dawn,  
Brushing with hasty steps the dew away,'  
etc.

Now the next line in Gray is—

'To meet the sun upon the upland lawn.'

And this sequence of ideas recurs in the imitator. Five lines further on he starts a clause with—

'Or on the upland stile, embowered'  
etc.

The same ode may serve to illustrate the fact that association ἀφ' ὁμοίων is sometimes combined with association ἀπὸ τοῦ σίμειν. That is to say, *A* suggests *B*, which resembles it, and *B* suggests *C*, which follows it, the product being *A' ... C'*. Thus:

## KIRKE WHITE.

*A'* { 'And haply then, with sudden swell,  
{ Shall roar the distant curfew bell,  
*C'* { While in the castle's mouldering tower  
{ The hooting owl is heard to pour  
{ Her melancholy song,  
(followed by an allusion to the moon).

followed: we lose the clue in the labyrinth. It will therefore be prudent to confine our analysis to examples which 'sautent aux yeux.'

And here it is worth while to note that reminiscences of this kind are by no means restricted to the minor poets. On the contrary, they occur here and there even in writers of the greatest force and originality. Tennyson's *In Memoriam* appeared in 1850, Browning's *The Ring and the Book* in 1868-9: an attentive reading of the following extracts will show that the latter sometimes borrows from the former. I have italicised only the more striking coincidences:

## TENNYSON.

*In Mem. lvi.*

'And he, shall he,  
*Man*, her last work, who seem'd so fair,  
 Such splendid purpose in his eyes,  
 Who roll'd the psalm to wintry skies,  
 Who built him fanes of fruitless prayer,  
 Who trusted God was love indeed  
 And love Creation's final law—  
 Tho' *Nature*, red in tooth and claw  
 With ravine, *shriek'd* against his creed—  
 Who loved, who suffer'd countless ills,  
 Who battled for the True, the Just,  
 Be blown about the desert dust,  
 Or seal'd within the iron hills?  
 No more? A *monster* then, a dream,  
 A discord. Dragons of the prime,  
 That *tare* each other in their *slime*,  
 Were mellow music match'd with him.'

Browning's two passages (*The Pope* 619 ff., *Caponsacchi* 1941 ff.) are connected, not only with the same canto of Tennyson's poem, but also with each other—the link between them being shown by the use of Clarendon type. The recurrence of the same topic (the

## WORDSWORTH.

*Intimations of Immortality.*

'Blank misgivings of a creature  
 Moving about in worlds not realized,  
 High instincts, before which our mortal  
 nature  
 Did tremble like a guilty thing surprised!  
 But for those first affections,  
 Those shadowy recollections,  
 Which, be they what they may,  
 Are yet the fountain light of all our day,  
 Are yet a master light of all our seeing;  
 Uphold us—cherish—and have power to  
 make  
 Our noisy years seem moments in the being  
 Of the eternal silence.'

## BROWNING.

*The Pope.*

619 'Scorched into dust, a plaything for  
 the winds.'  
 627 'some obscene tomb  
 They thought a temple in their ignor-  
 ance,  
 And clung about and thought to lean  
 upon—  
 There laughs it o'er their ravage,—  
 where are they?'  
 639 'No *monster* but a *man*—while *nature*  
*shrieked*  
 "Or thus escape, or die!"'  
 647 'Hence this consummate lie, this love-  
 intrigue,  
 Unmanly simulation of a sin,  
 With place and time and circumstance  
 to suit—  
 These *letters* false beyond all for-  
 gery—'  
 653 'As though the man had cut out shape  
 and shape  
 From fancies of that other *Aretine*.  
 To paste below—incorporate the filth  
 With cherub faces on a missal-page!'

*Caponsacchi.*

1941 'There, let them each *tear* each in  
 devil's-fun.'  
 1947 'Lure him the lure o' the *letters*,  
*Aretine*!  
 Lick him o'er *slimy*-smooth with jelly-  
 filth  
 O' the verse-and-prose pollution in  
 love's guise!'

pretended love-letters) in the course of his own poem apparently awakened in Browning's brain the old train of ideas which had previously led him to the *In Memoriam*.

Tennyson himself was under similar obligations to Wordsworth: *e.g.*—

## TENNYSON.

*In Mem. vii.*

'I cannot sleep,  
 And like a guilty thing I creep  
 At earliest morning to the door.  
 He is not here; but far away  
 The noise of life begins again,  
 And ghastly thro' the drizzling rain  
 On the bald street breaks the blank day.'

This  
 γλυσ-  
 —,  
 κακός  
 and

1  
 Mah-  
 of 38  
 athet-  
 402.



But it is time to turn our attention to classical examples. I have lingered over these English specimens because I believe that this kind of criticism, once thoroughly appreciated,—and we can appreciate it best in our own language—might have very fruitful results in the classical field.

(1) The method ἀφ' ὁμοίου may help to clear up a dark passage in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, in which Phaedra moralises to the following effect (380 ff.):—‘We know what is right, but we do not perform it, either because we are lazy or because we prefer some other pleasure’—

εἰσὶ δ' ἡδοναὶ πολλαὶ βίον,  
μακρὰι τε λέσχει καὶ σχολή, τερπνὸν κακόν,  
385 αἰδώς τε. δισσαὶ δ' εἰσὶν ἡ μὲν οὐ κακή,  
ἡ δ' ἄχθος οἴκων. εἰ δ' ὁ καιρὸς ἦν σαφής,  
οὐκ ἂν δὴ ᾗσθην ταῦτ' ἔχοντε γράμματα.

These lines have been chopped and changed in various ways by the editors.<sup>1</sup> The main objection to them is thus stated by Mr. Hadley: ‘That λέσχει, σχολή, αἰδώς should be selected as the typical pleasures, which interfere with the performance of a known duty; that thereupon a quibbling subdivision of αἰδώς into ‘not bad’ and ‘ruinous to households’ should be added...are disfigurements so offensive in their weakness, that I cannot believe Euripides, often as his subtlety outran his judgement, to be chargeable with them. The *pannus* is not even *purpureus*... One could find excuse for λέσχει and σχολή, the idle hours which Phaedra had spent watching Hippolytus as he exercised in the palaestra below (cf. Paus. ii. 32. 3); but αἰδώς is incomprehensible.’ Not so, if we bear in mind the principle of Association in reminiscence. In 384 f. Phaedra admits that among life's pleasures are to be reckoned those of coquetry, e.g. chats with Hippolytus (μακρὰι λέσχει), leisure to spend in his society (σχολή), coyness at his approach (αἰδώς). At the same time she acknowledges that these things, though pleasurable, are bad. Like Browning's lover she would say—

‘How sad and bad and mad it was—  
But then, how it was sweet!’

This mixture of praise and blame, this γλυκυπικρότης—if the word may be pardoned —, is aptly expressed by the phrase τερπνὸν κακόν, apparently an echo of Hesiod's *Works and Days* 57, where woman herself is de-

scribed as κακὸν ᾧ κεν ἅπαντες | τέρπωνται. That passage recalled to the poet's memory a second Hesiodic account of a thing at once good and bad: *ibid.* 317 αἰδώς, ἥτ' ἄνδρας μέγα σίνεται ἡδ' ὀνύησιν. The line must have been familiar to Euripides, for he paraphrases it again in *Erechth.* fr. 367 Dind. αἰδοῦς δὲ καὶ τὸς ὀνύκρως ἔχω πέρν | καὶ δὲ γὰρ αὐτῆς κάσιν αὐ (Badham for MSS. οὐ or οὐ) κακὸν μέγα. It suited his philosophic, not to say sophistic, vein; and he introduced the gist of it even where a dichotomy was out of place. In short, the *Hippolytus* passage reproduces  $A + B$  as  $A' \dots B'$ , the association between  $A$  and  $B$  in Euripides' mind being due to the fact that both describe a kind of equivocal or double-faced quality. Even so we have not quite exhausted its interest from a psychological point of view. Mr. Hadley complained that the description of αἰδώς as οὐ κακή is offensively weak. To my thinking it is a strong confirmation of the fact that Euripides had the second Hesiodic passage in view: for the line immediately preceding the said passage contains the old epic proverb αἰδώς δ' οὐκ ἄγαθὴ κεχρημένον ἄνδρα κομίζει. It is not perhaps too far-fetched to suggest that Euripides' thoughts ran on from this to the idea of λέσχει, the stepping-stone being Hes. *ibid.* 500 f. ἐλπίς δ' οὐκ ἄγαθὴ κεχρημένον ἄνδρα κομίζει, | ἡμενον ἐν λέσχει. If so, Eur. *Hipp.* 383 ff. is indeed a notable example of association ἀφ' ὁμοίου.

(2) A typical instance of association ἀπὸ τοῦ σύγγενος is afforded by Persius *sat.* 5. 135, where the expression ‘lubrica Coa’ is a clear reminiscence of Horace *sat.* ii. 4. 29 f.—‘albo non sine Coa. | lubrica nascentes implent conchylia lunae.’ Observe that here  $A$  and  $B$  (Horace's *Coa* and *lubrica*), though so closely connected with each other in position, are quite disconnected in meaning. Persius' coupling of the two together shows how mechanical this kind of reproduction may be. Indeed it often happens that  $A' \dots B'$  will thus do more or less violence to the original sense of  $A$  or  $B$  or both, according to the degree and extent of the imitator's unconsciousness—a very fluctuating factor in all such cases. A few examples will make the point clear.

In Theocr. 1. 5 f. the odd phrase ἐς τὴν καταρρεῖ | ἃ χίμαρος has proved a puzzle to all commentators. Rumpel, Hiller, and others translate ‘defluit, redundat,’ justifying their translation by a comparison of Hor. *od.* i. 28. 27 f. ‘multaque merces, | unde potest, tibi defluat.’ But could Horace have written ‘capella tibi defluat’? As

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Weil ej. δὲ φθορὰι for δ' ἡδοναὶ in 383; Mahaffy-Bury bracket as an interpolation the whole of 383 and the words αἰδώς τε in 385; Hadley athetises 384-387 inclusive, and places 388-390 after 402.

applied to a single definite animal the idea of plenty or superfluity is wholly out of place, *pace* Haupt *opusc.* ii. 309. Fritzsche renders 'ad te properat' and adds 'h. e. ultro ac lubens de monte ubi pascitur (κατά—) venit ad te.' Goats of course love the mountain-heights (Verg. *ecl.* 1. 76), indeed a scholion on Theocr. 1. 1 derives the word αἰπόλος from that fact! But the notion of the kid hurrying down the hill-side to its future owner somehow strikes one as grotesque. Mr. Cholmeley's version 'comes over to thee' (from what he leaves) is unsupported and can hardly be got out of the Greek. Meineke suggested 'tibi contingeret,' and certainly Theocritus seems to have meant something of the sort. At the same time no precise parallel has hitherto been produced: for in Bion 1. 55 τὸ δὲ πᾶν καλὸν ἐς σὲ καταρρεῖ the reference to Persephone permits us to translate the prefix more literally 'descends to thee.' The question remains, then: Why did Theocritus, when he wanted to say 'falls to thy lot,' choose the very unexpected verb καταρρεῖ? Unless I am mistaken, it was because he had running in his head at the moment certain lines of Sappho, which are fortunately still extant (*fr.* 4 Weir Smyth):

ἀμφὶ δ' ὕδωρ  
<ὑψοθεν> ψῦχρον κελάδει δὲ ὄσδων  
μαλίνων, αἰθυσσομένων δὲ φύλλων  
κῶμα καταρρεῖ.

## THEOCRITUS.

τὰ δ' οὐ φρενὸς ἄπεται αὐτᾶς  
ἀλλ' ὅκα μὲν τήνον ποτιδέρκεται ἄνδρα γελᾶσα,  
ἄλλοκα δ' αὖ ποτὶ τὸν ῥίπτει νόον. οἱ δ' ὑπ'  
ἔρωτος  
δηθὰ κυλοιδιόντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι.

Here ὑπ' ἔρωτος...κυλοιδιόντες reappears almost intact as ἔρωτα...κυλοιδιᾶ: but of the adjacent ideas only scattered and mutilated fragments survive, *viz.* οὐ φρενὸς > σπλάγχνον οὐκ, ποτιδέρκεται > τὸ βλέμμα, ῥίπτει νόον > διέρριπται...διάνοιαν. Taken singly or even collectively these fragments prove nothing;

## THEOCR. 1. 15 ff.

οὐ θέμις, ὦ ποιμὴν, τὸ μεσαμβρινόν, οὐ θέμις  
ἄμμιν  
συρίσδεν. τὸν Πᾶνα δεδοίκαμες· ἦ γὰρ ἀπ'  
ἄγρας  
τανικά κεκμακῶς ἀμπαύεται· ἔντι δὲ πικρός,  
καὶ οἱ ἀεὶ δριμύεια χολὰ ποτὶ ῥινὶ κάθηται.

This was a celebrated passage—at least, Hermogenes *περὶ ἰδεῶν* 2. 4 (Walz iii. 315) cites it as a fine description of landscape—and Theocritus as a student of early lyrical poetry was presumably familiar with it. When, therefore, in the opening couplet of his first idyll he too had occasion to describe the whispering sound of foliage, he readily slipped into first one and then another reminiscence of Sappho's stanza: *cp. lines*

5  
8 τῇν' ἀπὸ τᾶς πέτρας καταλείβεται ὑψοθεν  
ὑδωρ

16 f. An allusion to Pan's siesta.

The contiguity of the ideas expressed in the old Lesbian lines accounts for their reappearance 'en bloc' in the new Alexandrian poet. But, whereas καταρρεῖ was natural enough in Sappho's verse ('as the leaves rustle, sleep steals down'), in Theocritus it is unnaturally applied to ἀ χίμαρος. His memory was haunted by the word and, perhaps half-unconsciously, he sacrifices strictness of expression to a more or less mechanical repetition.

Theocritus in his turn served as a model to later writers. For example, Heliod. *Aeth.* 4. 7 contains a reminiscence of Theocr. 1. 36 ff., in which the same principle of association ἀπὸ τοῦ σύνεγγυς can be traced and an analogous deviation from the original meaning:

## HELIODORUS.

οὐ γὰρ καὶ παιδὶ γνώριμον, ἔφη, ψυχῆς εἶναι  
τὸ πάθος καὶ τὴν νόσον ἔρωτα λαμπρόν; οὐχ  
ὁρᾶς ὡς κυλοιδιᾶ μὲν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ τὸ  
βλέμμα διέρριπται καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ὠχρίθῃ,  
σπλάγχνον οὐκ αἰτιωμένη, τὴν διάνοιαν δὲ ἄλνει,  
κ.τ.λ.;

yet, lying as they do round about an undoubted imitation, they are probably 'disiecta membra' of the original context. Similarly in Longus, a more pronounced imitator of Theocritus, among numerous reminiscences of the idylls is the following:

LONG. *past.* 2. 19.

ἐκ Πανὸς ἦν τὰ φαντάσματα καὶ ἀκούσματα  
μηνιόντος τι τοῖς ναύταις· οὐκ εἶχον δὲ τὴν  
αἰτίαν συμβαλεῖν (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἱερὸν σεσύλητο  
Πανός) ἐς τε ἀμφὶ μέσην ἡμέραν ἐς ὕπνον οὐκ  
ἄθεε τοῦ στρατηγοῦ καταπεσόντος αὐτὸς ὁ Πᾶν  
ὡφθῇ τοιαύδε λέγειν.

The combination of Pan's anger and of sleep at midday clearly indicates that Longus is copying Theocritus (see also the context in both writers): but in Theocritus the siesta was that of Pan himself and the god's wrath was due to his sleep being disturbed by the herdsmen's pipe, while in Longus the siesta is that of the *strategos* and the

god's wrath has quite a different cause. In fact, it appears that the reproduction of contiguous ideas is compatible with a total change of scene.

A striking case of this is to be found in Thuc. ii. 75, 4 and 77, 4, which together form an echo of Pind. *Pyth.* 3. 36 ff.:

## PINDAR.

...πολλὰν δ' ὅρει πῦρ ἐξ ἑνὸς  
σπέρματος ἐνθόρον ἀίστωσεν ὕλαν.  
ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τεῖχει θέσαν ἐν ξυλίνῳ  
κ.τ.λ.

Mr. Marchant saw that in ii. 75, 4 Thucydides 'was probably thinking' of Pindar *Pyth.* 3. 38. Is it not highly probable that in ii. 77, 4 his mind reverted to the same passage? In Pindar the forest-fire on the mountains is a mere simile; in Thucydides it is an explanatory comment or foot-note: in neither writer is it an integral part of the narrative. So far the two are in agreement. But τεῖχος ξύλινον, which in Pindar means the pyre of Koronis, in Thucydides is used of the tower or scaffolding raised by the Plataeans above their ramparts. The phrase persists, though the situation changes. Again we appreciate the powerful influence of original juxtaposition.<sup>1</sup>

Aesch. *sept.* 367 f. perhaps furnishes another example: ἐλπίς ἐστι νύκτερον τέλος μολεῖν, | παγκλαύτωι ἀλγέων ἐπίρροθον. The reference is to slave-girls destined for the conqueror's bed: 'they must look to attend at a midnight rite that aids and abets their pitiful pains.' The occurrence of the unusual word ἐπίρροθος in conjunction with the thought of 'night' disposes me to accept Dr. Verrall's suggestion that 'Aeschylus probably intended to recall' Hes. *O.D.* 560 μακρὰ γὰρ ἐπίρροθοι εὐφρόναι εἰσί. In winter, said Hesiod, put your oxen on short commons, for they will get little work and much sleep — 'the long nights aid and abet them.' If this comparison is sound, observe the grim irony of the Aeschylean reminiscence. Night consults the comfort of the cattle: it is otherwise with those who are haled off ἱππηδὸν πλοκάμων.

But a more certain instance occurs in a later chorus of the same play, where Aeschylus is the imitated, not the imitator.

<sup>1</sup> Hdt. viii. 51 records the Delphic oracle τὸ ξύλινον τεῖχος ἀνάλωτον ἵσασθαι, and the next two chapters tell how the Persians ἐνέπρησαν πᾶσαν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν. But the connexion between 'wooden wall' and 'conflagration' is here purely accidental.

## THUCYDIDES.

ii. 75, 4 ξύλινον τεῖχος ξυθέντες.  
ii. 77, 4 ἤδη γὰρ ἐν ὅρεσιν ὕλην τριφθεῖσα  
ὑπ' ἀνέμων πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀπὸ ταῦτομάτου  
πῦρ καὶ φλόγα ἀνῆκε.

The billows of calamity, cry the chorus, are buffeting the bows of the ship of state—

761 περὶ πρύμναν πόλεως καχλάζει.  
μεταξὺ δ' ἀλὰ δι' ὀλίγον  
τείνει πύργος ἐν εἵρει.—

i.e. 'and between (us and death) a defence extends but a little space, a mere wall in breadth.'<sup>2</sup> The whole context is one consistent metaphor drawn from the behaviour of a merchant-ship at sea in a storm. This fact points to πύργος being used in a two-fold meaning: literally of course it denotes the Theban battlements, but as part of the metaphor it refers to the projecting 'towers' or 'turrets' (πύργοι) common on board merchantmen (C. Torr *Ancient Ships*, p. 59 f.) and excellently shown in a terracotta model from a grave at Amathus (Brit. Mus. *Excavations in Cyprus*, p. 112, fig. 164, 12). Of this passage Euripides has a distinct echo in his *Phoenissae* 1097 ff.:

ὡς τῷ νοσοῦντι τειχέων εἴη δορὺς  
ἀλκὴ δι' ὀλίγον. περιγὰμων δ' ἀπ' ὀρθίων  
λευκάσπιν εἰσορώμεν Ἀργείων στρατὸν  
κ.τ.λ.

The speech of the Messenger, in which these lines occur, deals throughout with the Argive attack on Thebes, and is precisely the setting in which we should expect to find a verbal reminiscence of Aeschylus' *septem contra Thebas*. But once more we notice that the reminiscence is confined to the sound and barely touches the sense. Euripides' lines are rendered by Mr. A. S. Way—

<sup>2</sup> Or perhaps 'and between (us and death) by way of a thin defence extends a mere wall in breadth.' Other translations and alterations are possible; but the general sense is clear.

'That, where the wall's defence failed,  
succour of spears  
Might be hard by. Then from the soaring  
towers  
We marked the white shields of the Argive  
host.'

It will be seen that ἀλλή δι' ὀλίγον, which in the *septem* meant 'a defence extending but a little space,' here means 'help not far off,' while πύργος with a 'double entendre' is replaced by the simple περιάμων.<sup>1</sup>

It has been shown that reminiscences associated by contiguity, not by similarity, often distort the meaning of their original. Such distortion, though commonly due to unconscious or at most half-conscious cerebration on the part of the imitator, may be fully conscious and of malice prepense—witness the intentional allusions of a parody or a satire. To take one instance, where many might be given. Aristophanes in the *Frogs* ridicules (a) the musical trills and (b) the incongruous jargon of the Euripidean chorus. (a) In 1313 ff. (cp. 1346 ff.) he addresses the spiders—

αἱ θ' ὑπωρόφιοι κατὰ γωνίας  
εἰειειειελίσσεται δακτύλους φάλαγγες  
ιστότονα πηνίσματα,  
κερκίδος αἰδοῦ μελέτας,

and (b) continues—

ἴν' ὁ φίλανλος ἔπαλλε δελ-  
φίς πῶραις κναεμβόλοις  
μαντεία καὶ σταδίου.  
οἰνάνθας γάνος ἀμπέλων,  
βότρυος ἔλικα πανσίπονον.

The comedian is throughout thinking of the chorus in Eur. *El.* 432 ff. and in particular of the unfortunate sentence (436 f.)—

ἴν' ὁ φίλανλος ἔπαλλε δελφίς πῶραις κναεμ-  
βόλοις  
εἰλισσόμενος.

L<sup>2</sup> there reads εἰελισόμενος, as Mr. C. H.

#### THEOCRITUS.

1. 95 f.:

ἦνθέ γε μὰν ἀδεία καὶ ἅ Κ ὑ π ρ ι ς γελάοισα,  
λά θ ρ ι α μὲν γ ε λ ά ο ι σ α, βαρὴν δ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν  
ἔχοισα.

<sup>1</sup> The word πύργων is found seven lines back at 1091; but this is probably accidental.

<sup>2</sup> Conceivably from the chorus in the *Ion* 452 ff., where we have μαντεύμασι (471) and στάδια (497), the latter being brought into connexion with a dance to the music of pipes. But the surviving plays of Euripides are, comparatively, so few that it would be unsafe to dogmatise.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Theocr. 23. 29. 30. *missim*, and some more

Keene is careful to note; and this looks like a genuine tradition of the musical score. Aristophanes, it appears, deliberately dissociated εἰλίσσω from the dolphin, to which the word if not the shake was perfectly appropriate, and transferred it to the spiders for the purpose of raising a laugh at Euripides' expense. He also made nonsense of the dolphin dancing to the boatswain's pipe by appending the phrase μαντεία καὶ σταδίου<sup>2</sup> and a further irrelevant tag from the *Hyppolyte* (fr. 765 Dind.).

Lastly, there are cases in which no violence is done to the original thought, the reminiscence being definite, if not conscious, throughout. An instance of the sort may be found in Theocritus. That he was intimately acquainted with the lyrical productions of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. is certain, and has already been remarked. Alcaeus perhaps was his favourite model.<sup>3</sup> But the Doric poems of Alcman must have had a special interest for him; and in their extant fragments not a few words and phrases occur that turn up again in the idylls.<sup>4</sup> Once at least we are enabled to detect an example of associated reminiscence free from distortion. Alcman (fr. 11 Weir Smyth) apostrophises a bacchante as follows:

ἔχοισα μέγαν σκύφον  
οἶά τε ποιμένες ἄνδρες ἔχουσιν,  
χερσὶ λεόντεον ἐν γάλα θεῖσα,  
τυρὸν ἐτέρησας μέγαν ἄτρυφον  
ἀργύφειόν τε.

Now Theocritus in his first idyll, after describing the prize-goat (26 ἂ δὲ ἔχοισ' ἐρίφως ποταμέλγεται ἐς δύο πέλλας) and giving a detailed account of the herdsman's cup (27 βαθὺν κισσύβιον, 143 σκύφος), goes on to mention τυρῶντα μέγαν λευκοῖο γάλακτος (58). The similarity of thought and language can hardly be fortuitous. The same may be said of the following excerpts from Theocritus and Nonnus:

#### NONNUS.

Dion. 34. 268: λά θ ρ ι α Κ ὑ π ρ ι δ ο ς ἔργα.  
ibid. 302 f.: ἀμφότερον γάρ,  
εἶχε νόον γ ε λ ά ο ν τ α, χόλον δ' ἀνέφηνε  
προσώπῳ.

isolated passages.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Alcman. fr. 3 Weir Smyth εἰλιχρύσω... κυπαῖρα = Theocr. 1. 30 εἰλιχρύσω, 5. 45 κύπειρος; Alcman. fr. 4. 40 f. 'Αγιδῶς τὸ φῶς δρῶ | F ὦτ' ἄλιον κ.τ.λ. = Theocr. 18. 26 ff.; Alcman. fr. 7 παρθενικαί... ἱμερόφωνοι = Theocr. 18. 2 παρθενικαί of Spartan girls, 28. 7 ἱμεροφώνων of the Graces; Alcman. fr. 26 μακωνίδων ἄρτων = Theocr. 7. 157 μάκωνας.

Meineke, who cited the latter passage from Nonnus, omitted to notice the former: but the two are clearly complementary. Again, the famous invocation of Athens that occurs in one of Pindar's dithyrambs (*fr.* 76 Chr.)—

ὦ τὰι λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι καὶ  
ἀοίδιμοι κ.τ.λ.—

is apparently<sup>1</sup> echoed in some verses of Simonides written to commemorate the dithyrambic victories of the tribe Akamantis (*fr.* 148 Bgk.)—

σοφῶν ἀοιδῶν ἐσκίασαν λιπαρὰν ἔθειραν,

<sup>1</sup> It is just possible that Pindar is here imitating Simonides, not *vice versa*; see J. Girard in *Dar. Sagl.* II. i. 241.

...ἰοστεφάνων θεῶν ἑκατὶ Μοισάν.

Examples could be multiplied without difficulty: for association ἀπὸ τοῦ σύνεγγυς is commoner than association ἀφ' ὁμοίου. Care should be taken, however, to quote only those cases in which *A'...B'*, the echoes of *A + B*, are separated by a distinct pause or by an appreciable interval. Where that pause or interval disappears and *AB* is reproduced as *A'B'*, we cannot be sure how far the reminiscence is really binary: it may be covered by the normal 'span of consciousness' and thus coalesce into an ordinary imitation better represented by the single symbols *O* and *O'*. As such, it no longer falls within the scope of this paper.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

## SOPHOCLEA.

### *Elektra.*

11 ff. ὅθεν σε πατὴρ ἐκ φονῶν ἐγώ ποτε  
πρὸς σῆς ὁμαίμου καὶ κασιγνήτης λαβὼν  
ἦνεγκα...

'Whence, from amid thy murdered father's blood,' &c. The mss. here give ἐκ φόνων, 'from (or after) the slaying.' As was shown in the June number of this *Review*, φοναί means 'blood' (shed), 'a bloody corpse or carcase,' 'carnage'; and this passage clearly gains much in force and vividness if we write φονῶν for φόνων. The ἐκ may be quite literal, for the children may well have been present at the banquet. In *Tr.* 557 f. δῶρον...δ παῖς ἔτ' οὔσα τοῦ δασυστέρνου πάρα | Νέσσον φθίνοντος ἐκ φονῶν ἀνελόμεν, Bergk has already restored φονῶν. What meaning he gave to the word I do not know; 'blood' is exactly what is wanted.

743 ff. ἔπειτα λύων ἥνιαν ἀριστερὰν  
κάμπτοντος ἵππου λανθάνει στήλην  
ἄκραν  
παίσας.

Though it is clear that the prime cause of this accident was, in the poet's intention, the loosening of the rein of the προσκείμενος (doubtless for the straight, just as the turn was being completed), the immediate cause has not yet been satisfactorily explained. It may be premised that it is highly improbable that the προσκείμενος went off to the right. The pressure of the yoke-horses, who were being guided round the turn,

would prevent his doing this, and his tendency would be the other way. As drivers know well, a horse's instinct is to 'cut the corner,' and he will always do so, if he is given his head. Nor, again, could this vagary on the part of the near horse produce the accident; unless it were actually stopped, the chariot would simply go past the pillar, as can be proved with a toy cart. It must be remembered that the wheels were small, and close behind the team. Another solution must therefore be sought. Now, the σειραφόροι were, as the term implies, attached to the car by traces. So far as I can discover, these formed their sole attachment, either to the car or to the other horses. If this is so, the accident described becomes a very simple matter. The προσκείμενος can, at will, deviate to the left at a wide angle from the other horses. Should he thus deviate at any point in the turn (supposing the driver to be taking it close), he can easily jerk the car sideways into the pillar so as to catch the wheel; and he can do this with especial ease when the wheels are clean off the ground, as they were from moment to moment.<sup>1</sup> I have measured a stout cob of 13½ to 14 hands, and find his greatest width to be 22 inches. Four such horses, allowing for the pole and some spacing, would therefore not take up more

<sup>1</sup> Since such an accident as Sophokles describes would apparently be impossible if the προσκείμενος were attached to his neighbour at the collar, or rather breast-band, there must have been some good reason for not so harnessing him.



than 9 ft. when harnessed to the chariot. The axle, according to Smith's *Dict. Antt.*, was 7 ft. long. Thus the *σειραφόροι* would not project more than 1 ft. beyond the end of the axle. In Buenos Ayres, at the present time, carts are driven with teams of as many as eleven horses. Of these one is in the shafts, and one is harnessed in front of him as leader. The rest, abreast of the leader, are attached to the body of the cart, the axle, and the shafts by traces; and these traces form their sole attachment either to the cart or to one another.

1458 *σιγᾶν ἄνωγα κἀναδεικνύναι πύλας.*

It does not seem to have been perceived that this order to throw open the doors is addressed to Elektra, no less than the command to be silent. *σιγᾶν* must be addressed to her, for she is the only person who has been speaking. We cannot suppose that Aigisthos refers to mutterings or

whisperings of the chorus or his own servants. But if *σιγᾶν ἄνωγα* is spoken to Elektra, so must *κἀναδεικνύναι* be also. It is with a reference to this command that Elektra says, so soon as Aigisthos has finished speaking (1464), *καὶ δὴ τελεῖται τὰ π' ἐμοῦ*, 'My duty I do perform,' and with the words flings the doors open. The combination *καὶ δὴ* now has its proper force; cp. Ar. *Av.* 175 *βλέψον κάτω*.—*καὶ δὴ βλέπω*, 'I am looking.' This bidding of Elektra to perform a servant's office suits well Aigisthos' character and present mood, and is only the last of many similar insults. Wunder's *σιγᾶν* (adopted by Wecklein and others), though mistaken, proceeded from a sound instinct. He had not thought that *κἀναδεικνύναι* might be addressed to Elektra, and justly felt that its reference must be that of *σιγᾶν*.

M. A. BAYFIELD.

#### THE EURIPIDEAN CATALOGUE OF SHIPS.

THE Chalcidian women who are the chorus of Euripides' Iphigenia in Aulis narrate, in the first stasimon, how they left their home to view the Greek fleet at Aulis, and describe (231 sq.) the position and number of the contingents:

*ναῶν δ' εἰς ἀριθμὸν ἦλθον  
καὶ θέαν ἀθέσφατον,  
τὰν γυναικείων ὄψιν ὁμμάτων  
ὥς πλῆσαιμι, μέλινον ἄδονάιν.*

There are obvious differences between this list and Homer's; the discrepancies have been noticed by the commentators on Euripides, but a single explanation of them has not yet been given.

The differences are General and Particular. In general Euripides has made a selection out of the Greek forces; he mentions Aenianes, Argives, Athenians, Boeotians, Eleans, Locrians, Mycenaeans, Phthiot, Phocians, Pylians, Salaminians, Taphians, and omits therefore the people of Aetolia, Arcadia, Argissa, Cephallenia, Cos, Crete, Euboea, Lacedaemon, Magnesia, Methone, Orchomenos, Ormenion, Pherae, Phylace, Rhodes, Syme, Tricca. His order also is not that of the Catalogue; he has transferred the arrangement of the camp at Troy to the harbour at Aulis. His list begins with the right wing, held by Achilles and

the Myrmidons, and ends with Ajax child of Salamis on the left. We are familiar with this order from Θ 224–226, Λ 7–9.

In particular Euripides differs from or agrees with Homer on the following points:

1. The Myrmidons. He agrees with Homer as to the leader (Achilles) and the number of the ships (50); he adds the figure-head of twenty of the ships.

2. The Argives. Eur. agrees with Homer as to the leaders, Sthenelus and Euryalus (though he omits Diomedes, to whom Homer gives a prominent position), but differs over the number of ships. Homer gives it as *ὀγδώκοντα*, Euripides says 'Ἀργείων δὲ ταῖσδ' ἰσὶν ἑπτὰ μῆραι | νᾶες ἔστασαν πέλας, i.e. 50, like the ships of Achilles.

3. Attica. Here there is a striking difference. Homer's leader is *νῆος Περσέω Μενεσθεύς*, and he devotes two lines to his excellence in marshalling horses and men: Euripides' chief is not named, but described as *ὁ Θησέως παῖς*. The Athenians in Homer bring 50 ships, in Euripides 60. Euripides adds the figure-heads.

4. Boeotia. The numbers agree, and one leader, Leitus, is taken from the five in Homer. Figure-heads are added.

5, 6. The account of the Phocians in Euripides has suffered a lacuna, which has not escaped the scribes of our two MSS.,



who leave a space of two lines, while one of them writes *λαίπ*. The Locrians are said to have the same number of ships as the Phocians, and this agrees with Homer, who gives 40 to both.

7. Mycenae. The numbers and the leader agree with Homer.

The lines that follow (268 sq.), *σὺν δ' ἀδελφὸς ἦν | ταγὸς ὡς φίλος φίλῳ*, with no mention of Menelaus' subjects, suggest that he was co-commander with Agamemnon, and that Euripides brought no Lacedaemonians to Troy, especially as Homer says of them *ἀπάτερθε δὲ θωρήσσοντο*. However, both the expressions already quoted (268) and

*τὰς φηγούσας μέλαθρα  
βαρβάρων χάριν γάμων  
πράξιν Ἑλλάς ὡς λάβοι*

seem so clear a paraphrase of Homer's 586 *τῶν οἱ ἀδελφεὸς ἦρχε βοῶν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος* and 589 *μάλιστα δὲ ἴετο θυμῷ | τίσασθαι Ἑλένης ὀρμήματά τε στοναχὰς τε* that it is difficult to suppose Euripides at once followed Homer's wording and departed from his sense. Perhaps therefore it is only a case of loose expression.

8. The number of the Pylians has fallen out in another lacuna, first detected by M. Weil. The figure-heads are added.

9. The Aenianes. This people are the *Ἐνιήνες* of Homer and Herodotus. Euripides gives them the Homeric leader, Γουνεὺς, but a different number of ships. Homer says (B 748) *Γουνεὺς δ' ἐκ Κύφου ἦγε δύω καὶ εἴκοσι νῆας*, Euripides states

*Αἰνάνων δὲ δώδεκα στόλοι  
ναῶν,*

or as Hermann would write it, *δωδεκάστολοι ναῖς*. In this case Euripides receives the important and significant support of a document. The papyrus Oxyrhynchus Pap. I. no. xx. p. 46 (s. ii. A.D. = B 730-828) reads for this line *καὶ δεκ*, which is evidently part of *δύο καὶ δέκα*.

10. Elis. Euripides gives no number of their ships, but he calls their leader Eurytus, who in Homer is the father of one of the two leaders.

11. The Taphians are not so called by Homer in the Catalogue; Euripides means by the name the inhabitants of Dulichium and the Echinades. He gives no number of their ships, but names the same leader, Μέγης. Euripides adds *de suo* that they were dependent on the Eleans.

283 *λευκῆρετμον δ' ἄρη  
Τάφιον ἦγεν ὧν Μέγης ἀνασσει,*

where there is nothing to call for Hermann's alteration *ἡγεμὼν* for *ἦγεν ὧν*.

12. Euripides closes the formation with Ajax *Σαλαμῖνος ἐντροφος* and 12 ships, agreeing with Homer.

How are these divergencies to be accounted for? If they are conscious why does Euripides accept them, and where did he find them?

The source of the Iphigenia in Aulis is usually said to be the Cypria, and this may be accepted, in the sense that we have no knowledge of any other early work which contained this part of the Tale of Troy. The Cypria, according to Proclus' abstract, contained no Catalogue of the Greek host. I am aware that Proclus' account has been considered defective, and Fick (Ilias p. 384) has definitely asserted that he omitted to mention the Greek Catalogue. However, it is plain that if we are to employ Proclus' analysis for any purpose at all, we must abide by his silence as much as by his statement; and the fact that he winds up his lengthy account by the sentence *καὶ κατάλογος τῶν τοῖς Τρωσὶ συμμαχησάντων* warrants the inference that there was no list of the Greek armament. Moreover, general considerations shew that in Euripides' age there was not more than one 'Catalogue' in existence. The stories of the historical importance of the Catalogue as a document (which go back to Herodotus) and of tampering with it, imply that there was only one such; further, the various poems of the Cycle appear, and have usually been considered, to presuppose the existence of the Iliad and Odyssey, and therefore it would be singular to find the Homeric Catalogue duplicated. The force of this last argument if it stood alone would be weakened by the fact that, as we see, Proclus mentions a Trojan catalogue; we may if we please suppose that special circumstances determined the insertion of this list, possibly the exiguity of the list of Trojan allies in the Iliad, or a wish to include Penthesilea and Memnon who are outside Homer's view. It is impossible to deny that there may have been in the Cypria details and figures of the forces scattered up and down in the poem, but there is all the less reason for supposing Euripides to have deserted the obvious Iliad-Catalogue and to have collected his details from the body of the Cypria, that he follows the order not of the mustering at Aulis—the scene of the Cypria—but of the camp at Troy. It seems, therefore, beyond proof or probability there was in Euripides'

time more than one Catalogue of the Greek host; the Homeric *δῆκοςμος*, which we possess, whatever its age or its ultimate origin, had certainly stood in its place since the establishment of the *κοινή*—or to employ no questionable terms, since the sixth century, and Euripides (whose statements agree with it in the main) can have used no other. We have still to explain why he diverges from it in certain points.

The selection of a minority of the Greek contingents for mention is due to the necessity of space; no chorus could contain the whole catalogue. Their arrangement, beginning with Achilles and ending with Ajax, and the transference of the order of the *ναύσταθμος* to the assembly at Aulis, may be due to the same class of considerations, the wish for variety or contrast to Homer, that is to say to literary and artistic reasons. The probability that this is so is increased by the reflection that we can hardly conceive a version of the Homeric catalogue so different from the vulgate as to contain all Euripides' peculiarities. The detail of the figure-heads, which Euripides adds in some cases, may or may not have significance; it is an archaeological point which apparently has not received attention.<sup>1</sup>

The variations in the details of the contingents can hardly be explained on these grounds. If we take the numerals we find the following differences in the number of ships.

	Euripides				Homer			
Argives ...	...	50	...	...	...	80	...	...
Athenians ...	...	60	...	...	...	50	...	...
Aenianes ...	...	12	...	...	...	22	...	...

Euripides' total is thirty less than Homer's. We cannot suppose that Euripides made these alterations designedly. The numerals have no literary value in themselves, and it does not seem likely that patriotism or antiquarian zeal had made the size of the contingents a living question. The attention of the learned in this matter was attracted to the total, not to the particulars. Thucydides in a well-known passage gives 1200 as the total of Agamemnon's fleet, whereas the actual total we arrive at by counting is 1186. The scholiast on Thucydides (I. 10) makes the singular statement that the real total is 1166, and we are not able to say if this is more than a clerical error of his. The poets, beginning with

Aeschylus (Ag. 45), Euripides (Andr. 106, Electra 2, Orest. 352) and Lycophron (Cassandra 210) talk of *χίλια ναῦς*, and the phrase mille rates with equivalents passes through the Latins from Virgil to Juvenal and I do not know how many late writers before Marlowe displayed the value of the *ἀπηρτισμένος ἀριθμός*—as the scholiasts on Euripides have it. An historian or a poet may say 1200 or 1000 for a sum which exactly is 1186, but no such reason holds for altering details.<sup>2</sup>

I pass to the variations in the leaders. The omission of Diomedes and the apparent transference of Menelaus to Mycene may be the result of careless writing, but in the case of Athens the discrepancy is complete. Menestheus son of Peteos was an offence to the ancients on the ground of his obscurity; Zenodotus athetised vv. 553, 554, in which his qualities are stated in hyperbolic terms. It is therefore important that Euripides gives a different chief, the son of the national hero Theseus. The lawfully begotten sons of Theseus were Demophon and Acamas;<sup>3</sup> the *Ἰλίου πέποις* makes them assist at the siege of Troy, but whether as leaders or private persons is not clear; the Cyclic poem is followed by Sophocles and by Euripides himself (Hecuba 125, Troades 31). I would not fall into history, but it may seem as if there were two versions of the Athenian contingent current in the fifth century, and that one sent the Theseid princes to Troy. The point occupied ancient historians, among others Hellanicus fr. 45, Plutarch Theseus 35, Eustathius 284, 29.

In the case of the Eleans it would be a very gross instance of carelessness if we were to suppose Euripides' statement *Εὐρωτος δ' ἄνασσε* a hasty copy or reminiscence of Homer's lines *τῶν μὲν ἄρ' Ἀμφίμαχος καὶ Θάλαπιος ἡγήσασθην | νῆες δ' μὲν Κτεάτων ὃ δ' ἄρ' Εὐρέτων Ἀκτορίωνος*; but if we do not we imply a considerable disturbance of tradition. (There is a variant in the lines—*ἀκτορίωνος* vulg., *ἀκτορίωνε* Aristarchus and a few MSS.—but it can hardly be brought into connection with Euripides' statement).

<sup>2</sup> Preoccupation on this subject is shewn in the scholia (B 122, 130, 488; O 56, 562; O 407; Π 170) and Eustathius (on B 484, 718), who are mainly taken up with Thucydides' discrepancy and his method of striking an average between the largest and the smallest contingent; and an echo seems to lurk in the enumeration of the ships in various MSS., either on the margin (as in the Venetus 454) or at the end of the Catalogue.

<sup>3</sup> The authorities are given in the articles on Acamas in the new edition of Pauly, and on Acamas and Demophon in Roscher's Lexicon.

<sup>1</sup> Similar national cognizances however are known on monuments and coins, see *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* xx. 549 sq. 'Παράσημα de Villes sur des Stèles de Proxénie' by M. Paul Perdrizet.

Again when Euripides asserts the dependence of the islanders on the Eleans, we may think the statement suggested by Homer's language *νήσων αἱ ναίουσι πέτρην ἄλδς Ἡλίδος ἄντα*, but it is hardly likely that a poet alluding to the matter more for its sound than its sense should take the trouble to draw such a conclusion and express it.

To what result do these details point? If the poet cannot have invented the variants, and if they depart too widely from Homer to be due to pure carelessness, and yet there is no other source but Homer to which they can be referred, whence do they come? I suggest that Euripides' source was really responsible for these divergencies, but that his source was still Homer. He used Homer but in a version which was not the vulgate.

The variants upon the Catalogue which we know of are mostly geographical, and consist of the substitution of one place-name for another. They are to be found in Strabo and Eustathius and as a rule have not affected the MSS. There are a few variants upon other subjects: of these such as are concerned with numerals are Eustathius' statement that some read *ἄγεν τρισκαίδεκα* for *ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα* *νήας* B 557 in the account of Ajax's contingent (a reading confirmed by Matro's parody 95 *παῖς δέ τις ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν τρισκαίδεκα νήας*), and the lection in Oxyrhynch. Pap. I. no. xx. p. 46 *καὶ δεκ for δῶκα καὶ εἰκοσι* B 748 to which I have referred above. Then we are told that there was a mention of Stentor in the Arcadian section and of Astropaeus among the Paeonians, neither of which are in our MSS.

I suggest that the edition of Homer used by the author of the Iphigenia in Aulis was of the same character. It contained variations in the number of the contingents, and added some and omitted others, of the heroes who led them. If this suggestion is probable, we have so much information as to the character of a fifth century edition of Homer which was not the vulgate. I will make a guess at what edition it was.

The Iphigenia in Aulis is stated, by a scholiast on the Frogs (67), to have been brought out after the poet's death by his son of the same name, and the critics have enjoyed the justification for dividing the play between the father and the supposed diasceust the son. The part of the first stasimon which we have examined is bracketed by some editors, printed in small type by others, as the work of the junior

Euripides. From such peculiarly fruitless speculation I would keep apart, but I will note a coincidence. The son of the scholiast on the Frogs is called by Suidas a nephew, *ἀδελφιδόης*. The same lexicographer gives us the information that a nephew of Euripides, and of the same name, made an edition of Homer. The Euripidean edition, which long led a precarious existence on the strength of Suidas' article and a mention in Eustathius, has leapt into fame on account of the brilliant and apparently necessary emendation by which Blass restored the name in 'Ammonius' commentary on Φ (Oxyrhynchus Pap. II. no. 221). It is remarkable that such information as we have about the *Εὐριπίδειος* belongs exclusively to the Catalogue. Eustathius stated that Euripides added after 866 the line *Τρωῶν ὑπο νιφόεντι ὕδρῳ ἐν πτόνι δῆμῳ*, a verse recognised by Strabo, who however weakened Euripides down to *τινές*. Blass' conjecture makes Euripides and other editors add the line *Πηλέγονος θ' υἱὸς περιδέξιος Ἀσπεροπαῖος* to 848; here too the existence of the line was remembered, but the name of its sponsor forgotten (*ὃν ἐν πολλαῖς τῶν Ἰλιάδων φέρεσθαι* schol. T on Φ 140). If then the nephew of Euripides included in his edition lines of the Catalogue which were absent from the vulgate, it would not be out of character for him to use for his play a text of the Catalogue of like character.

I suggest that the younger Euripides was like Antimachus at once poet and editor, and that in composing or arranging the portion of his uncle's play which was directly Homeric he drew upon his own edition. It is not difficult to transfer some of the variants of the chorus into Homer, and to call the result the Euripidean text. The numerals are not obstinate: B 568 *τοῖσι δ' ἅμ' ὀγδώκοντα μέλαινα νῆες ἔποντο* will become *τοῖσι δὲ πεντήκοντα*, and *ἐξήκοντα* may take the place of *πεντήκοντα* in the Athenian section without much violence. It is a more serious undertaking to substitute Theseus' son for Menestheus son of Peteos, but if we choose Demophon *τῶν αὖ Δημοφῶν Θήσεως παῖς ἡγεμόνευε* may serve our turn, and *παῖς* may perhaps commend the line. Acamas I will leave to his backers. Into Euripides' ideas and sources I do not wish to inquire,<sup>1</sup> but here he may have wished to remove the discrepancy between the Homeric Catalogue and Cyclic

<sup>1</sup> A preference for the Cycle, as historical evidence, over the Iliad, is obvious, and not peculiar to the younger Euripides.

Legend, and to give the house of Theseus its definite place at Troy, in the same way as he justified the mention of Asteropaeus in the later books of the Iliad by inserting his name among the leaders of the Paenians.

The difference about the Aenianes may be met by altering Γουνεύς δ' ἐκ Κύφου ἦγε δύνω καὶ εἴκοσι νῆας into Γουνεύς δ' ἐκ Κύφοιο ἄγεν δύνω καὶ δέκα νῆας, and the noun and adjective κύφος may excuse the violence done to the quantity.

The variants of fact imply the addition or omission of lines, which it would be idle to attempt to invent; moreover I am far from suggesting that all Eur.'s disagreements with Homer were included in his or any edition.

Another combination may be made. I have noticed that Euripides' number 12 for the Aenianes' ships corresponds with the fragmentary reading of a papyrus in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri vol. i. It is singular that this papyrus adds a line in the Cata-

logue, namely, ἐνθα ἴδον πλείστους Φρύγας ἀνέρας αἰολοπόλους after 798. It has therefore in one place Euripides' actual reading in the play, in another it resembles Euripides in his known characteristic of adding a line. I suggest that this second century papyrus is in very fact the Εὐριπίδειος. 'Ammonius' quotes it, in the first or second century A.D., and there is nothing to prove he did not quote it first-hand; and we know that a nameless edition which Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt found in a papyrus of the third century B.C. was used and quoted by Plutarch in the second century of our era.

I do not present this hypothesis as true, but as possible. The certainty belonging to combinations of surviving statements of particulars must always be slight; and this is in most cases, and especially in literary history, all the license that Fortune has permitted us upon the patient ancients.

T. W. ALLEN.

## ON THE FRAGMENTS OF EURIPIDES.

(NAUCK'S NUMERATION.)

Fr. 262:

πάλοι σκοποῦμαι τὰς τύχας τὰς τῶν βροτῶν,  
ὡς τεύ μεταλλάσσουσιν· ὅς γὰρ ἂν σφαλῇ  
εἰς ὀρθὸν ἔσται χῶ πρὶν εἰτυχῶν πίτνει.

εἶ cannot stand, but extant conjectures do not account for themselves. Read ὡς πνεύματα ἀλλάσσουσιν ('how they change their winds'), and cf. Eur. H.F. 216 ὅταν θεός σοι πνεῦμα μεταβαλὼν τύχη.

Fr. 456:

τῶν γέροντα δὴ τήνδ' ἐγὼ δίδωμί σοι  
πληγὴν.

Read ἐν νήτριαν ('the blow that gives thy quietus') and cf. Soph. O.T. 961 σμικρὰ παλαιὰ σώματ' εὐνάζει ῥοπή, Trach. 1041 εὐνασον, εὐνασὸν μ' ὤκνετα μόρω, Ap. Rh. 4, 1058 εὐνήτειρα νύξ ἔργων.

Fr. 533:

τερπνὸν τὸ φῶς μοι ἴτόδ' ἐπὶ γῆν δι' αἶδον  
σκότος  
οὐδ' εἰς οὐρα οὐδ' εἰς ἀνθρώπους μολαῖν†

Read

τερπνὸν τὸ φῶς μοι· τὸ δ' ἐπὶ γῆν Αἶδον  
σκότος  
οὐδ' εἰς ἐνερθεν οἶδ' εἰς ἀνθρώπους μολών.

i.e. 'but the darkness under earth not one knoweth, having come among mankind from beneath.' [The neut. σκότος ought to have been frankly accepted: cf. fr. 555].

Fr. 555:

τοῦ δῆκται πως κύνες οἱ θεοί,  
ἀλλ' ἡ Δίκη γὰρ καὶ κατὰ σκότος βλέπει....

The second line is sound (cf. fr. 533). For the first I suggest

οὐκ ἀκροδῆκται, κύνες ὅπως, εἰσὶν  
θεοί

i.e. 'the vengeance of the Gods is not hasty; they are not like dogs always ready to bite.' Cf. ἀκρομανής, ἀκροσφαλής, ἀκράχολος.

Fr. 674:

In Hesych. 2 p. 67 ἐλίσσων· πλέκων, ψενδόμενος, οὐκ ἐπὶ εὐθείας λέγων, †ἡ κοινὸν the ordinary emendation is ἡ κινῶν. Better, I think, is μηκύνων.

Fr. 730:

ἅπαντα †Πελοπόννησος εἰτυχεῖ πόλις.

Read νήσου Πέλοπος (since Πελοπόννησος is not a πόλις and, as Nauck observes, 'mira est Πελοπόννησος forma.')

## Fr. 739 :

φεῦ, φεῦ, τὸ φῦναι πατρὸς εὐγενοῦς ἀπο  
 ὅσῃν ἔχει φρόνησιν ἀξίωμα τε.  
 κἂν γὰρ πίνης ὦν τυγχάνῃ, χρηστὸς γεγώς  
 τιμὴν ἔχει τιν', ἀναμετρούμενος δέ πως  
 τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς γενναῖον ὠφέλει τρόπῳ.

The passage is sound except in the word marked.

Read  $\phi \alpha \iota \nu \epsilon \iota$  τρόπῳ ('he shows in his own character his father's nobility'). The corruption was assisted by  $\alpha \iota = \epsilon$ .

## Fr. 813 :

ὦ πλοῦθ', ὅσῳ μὲν ῥᾶστον εἴ βάρος φέρειν,  
 πόνοι δὲ κἂν σοὶ καὶ φθοραὶ πολλαὶ βίου  
 εἴναισ'. κ.τ.λ.

[Al.  $\omega$  πλοῦτ',  $\omega$  πλοῦτε].

Read  $\omega$  πλοῦτ', ἴσως μὲν κ.τ.λ. ('it may be very true that...')

## Fr. 833 :

τίς δ' οἶδεν εἰ ζῆν τοῦθ' ὃ κέκληται θανεῖν,  
 τὸ ζῆν δὲ θνησκεῖν ἐστί; πλὴν ὅμως βροτῶν  
 νοσοῦσιν οἱ βλέποντες, οἱ δ' ὁλωλότες  
 οὐδὲν νοσοῦσιν οὐδὲ κέκτηνται κακά.

Read πλὴν ὅπως, i.e. 'except (for the knowledge) that...'

## Fr. 1027 :

παῖς ὦν φυλάσσουν πραγμάτων αἰσχροῶν ἄπο.

Read  $\alpha \phi \alpha \varsigma$ .

## Fr. 1035 :

δύστηνος ὅστις καὶ τὰ καλὰ ψευδῇ λέγων  
 οὐ τοῖσδε χρῆται τοῖς κακοῖς ἀληθέσιν.

Read

δύστηνος ὅστις  $\mu \alpha \lambda \theta \alpha \kappa \alpha$  ψευδῇ λέγων  
 οὐ τοῖσδε χρῆται  $\mu \alpha \lambda \theta \alpha \kappa \omicron \iota \varsigma$  ἀληθέσιν.

[Cf. fr. 1036].

## Fr. 1042 :

ἅπαντές ἐσμεν εἰς τὸ νοθετεῖν σοφοί,  
 αὐτοὶ δ' ἁμαρτάνοντες οὐ γινώσκομεν.

This may be right, of course. I merely wish to observe that when, in Stobaeus, there appear *ὅταν σφάλωμεν* (sic) and *ὅταν ποιῶμεν* as variants to *ἁμαρτάνοντες*, we may guess that the original of Stobaeus had *ὅταν πταίωμεν*.

## Fr. 1059, 4-6 :

ἀλλ' οὐδὲν οὕτω δεινὸν ὥς γυνὴ κακόν  
 οὐδ' ἂν γένοιτο ἱγράμμα τοιοῦτ' ἐν ἱγραφῇ,  
 οὐδ' ἂν λόγος δεῖξειεν.

τοιοῦτον Nauck. I should read

οὐδ' ἂν γένοιθ' ὄραμα τοῖον ἐν γραφῇ.

In some other instances I advance suggestions which may be worth consideration, even if the context is not sufficient (or sufficiently explicit) to admit of anything like certainty.

## Fr. 154 :

<A.> τὸ ἱζῆν ἀφέντες τὸ κατὰ γῆν τιμῶσι  
 σου.

<B.> κενόν γ'. ὅταν γὰρ ζῇ τις, εὐτυχεῖν  
 χρεών.

Probably τὸ ζῶν, as σου and the context indicate.

## Fr. 170 :

οὐκ ἔστι Πιεθοῦς ἱερὸν ἄλλο πλὴν λόγος,  
 καὶ βωμὸς αὐτῆς ἔστ' ἐν ἀνθρώπου φύσει.

Perhaps  $\phi \rho \alpha \varsigma \epsilon \iota$ .

## Fr. 248, 2 sq. :

μισῶ γὰρ ὄντως οἵτινες φρονοῦσι μὲν,  
 φρονοῦσι δ' οὐδενός τε χρημάτων ὕπερ.

Perhaps

φρονοῦσι δ' οὐδὲν ὥς τε  $\chi \rho \eta \mu \alpha \tau'$  εὐπο-  
 ρεῖν.

## Fr. 271 :

πτηνὰς διώκει, ὦ τέκνον, τὰς ἐλπίδας.

τοῦχ ἢ τύχη γέτ' τῆς τύχης δ' οὐχ εἰς τρόπος.

Read  $\epsilon \upsilon \chi \eta$   $\tau \acute{\upsilon} \chi \eta$   $\gamma \epsilon$  ('thou boastest in thy fortune, it is true'). [The second pers. mid. for tragedy is -η, not -ει.]

## Fr. 437 :

ὁρῶ δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐγὼ  
 τίκτονσαν ὕβριν τὴν πάροιθ' εὐπραξίαν.

Commentators mostly suspect *πάροιθ'*. Perhaps *πατρόθεν*, the reference being to a *εὐπραξία* which does not come of personal merit or exertion.

## Fr. 528 :

μισῶ ἱγυναικά, ἐκ πασῶν δὲ σέ.

[al. γυναικάς]. Perhaps  $\mu \iota \sigma \omega < \gamma' \alpha \epsilon \iota >$   
 γυναικάς.

## Fr. 572 :

ἐν ἔστι πάντων πρῶτον εἰδέναι ἥτοδε (al. τουτί)

Read  $\delta \epsilon \omicron \nu$ !

## Fr. 578, 3 sqq. :

ἐξηῆρον ἀνθρώποισι γράμματ' εἰδέναι,  
 ὥστ' οὐ παρόντα ποιντίας ἐπὲρ πλακὸς  
 τάκει κατ' οἴκους πάντ' ἐπίστασθαι καλῶς,  
 παισὶν ἥτ' ἀποθνήσκοντα γραμμάτων μέτρον  
 γράψαντας εἰπεῖν, τὸν λαβόντα δ' εἰδέναι.

The lengthening before *θν* in (the prosaic) *ἀποθνήσκοντα* would be unique for tragedy. Scaliger gave *χρημάτων* for *γραμμάτων*, but



perhaps the claims of *παμάτων* may be regarded. Adopting *χρημάτων* provisionally, I should read

παισὶν θ' ἅπαν θνήσκοντα χρημάτων μέτρον  
γράφαντά τ' εἰπεῖν, τὸν λαβόντα τ' εἰδέναι.

Fr. 611:

Hesych. †ἀντεμμάσασθαι· ἀνταποδοῦναι, ἐπι-  
πλήξαι.

Perhaps ἀνταμεύσασθαι (= ἀνταμείψασθαι).

Fr. 643:

βαρὺ †τὸ φρόνημ' †οὔησις ἀνθρώπου κακοῦ.

Salmasius gave φόρημ', with which I should suggest

βαρὺ τοι φόρημ' οὔδεσις ἀνθρώπου κακοῦ.

(i.e. his 'inflation').

Fr. 815:

δμῶσιν δ' ἐμοῖσιν εἶπον ὡς †τουτηρίαίς  
πυρίδες καὶ διπετῇ κτείναι†

[Obiter emend. Erotian. διπετῆς ὁ γόνος το  
διπετῆς· ἀγνόε].

Valckenaer restored καυτήρια in the first  
line. For the rest read perhaps

<Χρ εἶη> πύρῳ δὲ καὶ διπετῇ κτίσαι.

[For κτείναι and κτίσαι confused see Aesch.  
Cho. 440].

Fr. 1046:

πολλοῦ γὰρ χρυσοῦ καὶ πλούτου  
κρείσσων πάτρα σώφρονι ναίειν.  
τὸ δὲ σύντροφον ἄδύ τι θνητοῖς  
†ἐν βίῳ χωρεῖ†.

The metre is uncertain. The sense is satis-  
fied with ἐμβιῶναι κυρεῖ.

T. G. TUCKER.

## ARISTOPHANICA.--I.

### ACHARNIANS.

IN the earlier part of the parabasis the poet praises himself, as he so often does, for the courage and true patriotism which he has shown. When the allies bring their money to Athens, they will all be eager to catch sight of the brave and honest poet:

646 οὗτω δ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς τόλμης ἥδη πόρρω  
κλέος ἦκει,  
ὅτε καὶ βασιλεὺς, Λακεδαιμονίων τὴν πρεσ-  
βείαν βασανίζων,  
ἠρώτησεν πρῶτα μὲν κ.τ.λ.

Now, if οὗτω δέ is right, we should expect not ὅτε but ὥστε. Someone has suggested ὡς in the sense of ὥστε. But, though such a ὡς is admissible in poetry and is much affected by Xenophon, it is extremely rare otherwise and is not (I think) ever found in Aristophanes, nor is there any reason apparent why it should have got changed to ὅτε. If, on the other hand, ὅτε is right, οὗτω δέ refuses to harmonise with it. Recognising this and remembering *Eq.* 530 οὗτως ἠνέστη ἐκεῖνος, Elmsley changed οὗτω δέ to οὕτως, and others, e.g. Dr. Blaydes, have followed him. But *Eq.* 530 is not parallel and οὕτως is not suitable, for there the οὕτως clause winds up the sentence, whereas here ὅτε κ.τ.λ. carries it on, so that οὕτως would have to perform the impossible task of looking both backwards and forwards at the same time. If οὕτως refers to the poet's

fame among the Greek allies, the Great King's knowledge of him cannot be brought in to illustrate it.

I have little doubt that Aristophanes wrote οὕτως δέ. *Truly his fame has spread wide.*

In the first place οὕτως and οὕτως are frequently exchanged for one another by copyists. Which word is the right one in this or that passage is immaterial to the argument, but it will be found that the MSS. often vary between them: e.g. Plato *Euthyd.* 303 E: *Theaet.* 198 D: *Laws*, 708 D: *Critias*, 106 A: *Xen. Hell.* 7. 4. 3: [Arist.] *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1422 a 21. In other places the more familiar οὕτως has driven out an original οὕτως altogether, and the latter has only been replaced by modern critics.

In the second place the emphatic οὕτως is quite at home at the beginning of the sentence. Cf. such passages as Plato *Soph.* 236 D οὕτως, ὦ μακάριε, ἐσμὲν ἐν παντάπαστι χαλεπῇ σκέψει: *Phil.* 44 B: *Laws*, 708 D.

Finally compare the words of Xenophon *Hipparch.* 5. 9, which resemble our passage as much as if they had been written to illustrate it: οὕτως γὰρ οὐδὲν κερδαλέωτερον ἐν πολέμῳ ἀπάτης, ὅπότε γε καὶ οἱ παῖδες ὅταν παίζωσι ποσὶν δα δύνανται ἀπατᾶν κ.τ.λ.

On the use of οὕτως in Aristophanes see Starkie's note to *Wasps* 997.

655. A few lines further on he pretends that the Lacedaemonians will try to appropriate him,



ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς τοι μή ποτ' ἀφήθ', ὡς κωμωδῇσαι τὰ δίκαια.

So the editors after Tyrwhitt, but the MSS. have ἀφήσετε, ἀφήσεθ', or ἀφήσηθ' (Van Leeuwen).

There are reasons for suspecting both the grammar and the metre here, and the two suspicions confirm one another. As to the grammar, if τοι is to be joined with a μή, μήτοι is the established order, not τοι μή. See, for instance, Soph. O.C. 1439 μήτοι μ' ὀδύρου, and 1407 μήτοι με πρὸς θεῶν—μή μ' ἀτιμάσῃ γέ: Aesch. P.V. 625. Then the division of the anapaestic line should coincide with the pause of the sense at ἀφήθ', not come awkwardly attaching ὡς to what precedes and cutting it off from its own clause. We can easily remedy this defect by writing ὡς κωμωδεῖ for ὡς κωμωδῇσαι, the present tense being at least as suitable. This leaves us a syllable short in the first half of the verse, and then we see in a moment what the poet wrote,

ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς οὐ τοι μή ποτ' ἀφήθ', ὡς κωμωδεῖ τὰ δίκαια,

just as seven lines below he writes οὐ μή ποθ' ἄλω. The ἀφήσετε of the MSS. does, therefore, in a way, represent the true meaning, and may somehow have grown out of it. The MSS. certainly help to show that the line as usually printed is not right.

In the next line (656) φησὶν δ' ὑμᾶς πολλὰ διδάξεν ἀγᾶθ' κ.τ.λ., Hamaker has with reason demurred to διδάξεν, considering the τὰ βέλτιστα διδάσκων in the very same sentence, and suggested ἐτι δρᾶσεν. Before finding his suggestion in Baydes' note, I had thought of ποιῇσιν.

683 τονθορύζοντες δὲ γήρα τῷ λίθῳ προσέσταμεν,  
οὐχ ὀρώντες οὐδὲν εἰ μή τῆς δίκης τὴν ἡλύγην  
ὁ δὲ νεανίας ἑαυτῷ σπουδᾶσας ξυνηγορεῖν  
εἰς τάχος παῖε ξυνάπτων στρογγύλοισι τοῖς ῥήμασιν.

The difficulty of 685 is well-known. Elmsley and others following him think we may make νεανίας accusative plural or read νεανίαν, and translate 'but the other (the adversary) having taken care to have young men (a young man) assisting him in the prosecution (or prosecuting for him) engages us and strikes, &c.' But (1) if the prosecutor could call in a young spark to help him, so could the defendant: (2) nothing can get over the awkwardness of language by which the prosecutor, after calling in an assistant,

NO. CXXXV. VOL. XV.

is himself said to carry on the fray, when the meaning must be that it is the νεανίας who παῖε ξυνάπτων &c., because the gist of the whole passage is the opposition of young and old. Dr. Merry rightly points out the difficulty of describing the prosecutor as 'doing *per se* what he is really doing *per alium*.'

But neither is Merry's own explanation at all satisfactory. He explains that 'the young barrister' (ὁ δὲ νεανίας) is only anxious to 'advance himself personally' (ἑαυτῷ ξυνηγορεῖν). This strains the use of the dative and does not give us a really good sense. What is there to show that this is the young man's one desire? He is not represented as spoiling his case by display of cleverness. He does just what is effectual, that is, he bewilders and silences the old man opposed to him. What proof of self-seeking is there in this?

The only emendation that deserves consideration is one made by a modern Greek scholar and adopted by Van Leeuwen in his recent edition of the play as *emendatio praestantissima*. Kontos proposes ὁ δὲ νεανίας ἑάν τῳ σπουδᾶσας ξυνηγορή.

This is certainly ingenious, though the hypothetical ἑάν is not very satisfactory to me; but I think we may perhaps do better. With the insertion of one letter I would read

ὁ δὲ νεανίας ἐπ' αὐτῷ, σπουδᾶσας ξυνηγορεῖν, κ.τ.λ.,

taking ἐπ' αὐτῷ in the sense of 'matched against him,' 'told off to deal with him.' So of the champions who are matched against others in the *Septem* we read (447)

ἀνὴρ δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ, καὶ στόμαργός ἐστ' ἄγαν,  
αἰθῶν τέτακται λῆμα

and again (620)

ὁμῶς δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ φῶτα Λασθένοὺς βίαν  
ἐχθρόζενον πυλωρὸν ἀντιτάξομεν.

So in Thuc. with τετάχθαι, 2. 70. 1. λόγους προσφέρουσι . . . τοῖς στρατηγοῖς . . . τοῖς ἐπὶ σφίσι τεταγμένοις: 3. 13. 3. αἱ δὲ (νῆες) ἐφ' ἡμῖν τετάχθαι, and in *Theaet.* 172 e the adversary in court ἀνάγκην ἔχων ἐφέστηκεν. In these passages there is no doubt a verb added, but it does not seem necessary. We might possibly attach ἐπ' αὐτῷ to ξυνηγορεῖν, if we cared to do so. For myself I would rather point it off as above with a comma.

No one should take exception to αὐτῷ on the ground that it has no one to refer to, as προσέσταμεν is plural. It is common in

A A

Greek to pass thus from plural to singular (*we, they, a man, &c.*) or from singular to plural; and Aristophanes in particular indulges in this confusion of numbers to a surprising extent, e.g. *Thesm.* 789

εἰ κακὸν ἔσμεν, τί γαμειῖθ' ἡμᾶς, εἴπερ ἀληθῶς  
κακὸν ἔσμεν,  
κάπαγορεύετε μὴτ' ἐξελεθεῖν μὴτ' ἐκκύψασαν  
ἀλῶναι;

Let any one study *Clouds* 988-9: *Wasps* 552-558 and 564-568: *Peace* 639-641: *Frogs* 1071-1076: *Eccles.* 663-672, and he will not hesitate over αὐτῶ.

717 κάξελαύνειν χρὴ τὸ λοιπὸν κἂν φύγη τις  
ζημιῶν  
τὸν γέροντα τῷ γέροντι, τὸν νέον δὲ τῷ νέῳ.

It seems hopeless to try to make sense of κἂν φύγη τις. But Blaydes' δφλη (or ἀλῶ) and Van Leeuwen's σφαλή are too far from φύγη to be at all probable. The editors do not seem to notice the scholium on this passage: κἂν ἐξελαύνειν χρὴ κἂν φύγη ζημιῶν, ὑπὸ γέροντος τοῦτο πάσχειν τὸν γέροντα. There is no room in the verse for κἂν ἐξελαύνειν—ἐξελαύνειν must be right from the parallel in Antiphanes—but the scholium may point to something like κἂν φύγη τις ζημιῶι.

To these remarks on the parabasis I will only add that the ἐξ οὗ γε with which it starts (628) ought to be ἐξ οὔτε, one of Blaydes' suggestions. 'Εξ οὔτε is a recognised expression in verse (e.g. *Eum.* 25: *Pers.* 762), whereas ἐξ οὗ γε is probably unique nor do I see what γε would mean.

But before leaving the *Acharnians* there are one or two other passages I would ask leave to say a few words about. One is the offer of Dicaeopolis in 318

κἂν γε μὴ λέξω δίκαια μῆδὲ τῷ πλήθει δοκῶ,  
ὑπὲρ ἐπιζήνου' θελήσω τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔχων λέγειν.

Editors are pretty well agreed now that the last line cannot be right. The dactyl in τὴν κεφαλὴν is inadmissible. We need not lay stress on the illogical expression of the offer (*if I don't convince the people, I will speak with my head on a block*), for it is only an abbreviation, as Van Leeuwen says, and probably many readers never notice it. ἦν and εἰ are indeed often used in this way, *on the chance that*, but the clause containing them does not usually come first. But the awkwardness of λέγειν after μὴ λέξω is considerable. All sorts of substitutes for κεφαλὴν have been proposed (*δέρην, σφαγὴν, λάρυγγ'*), or other alterations of the line suggested.

Porson strangely thought τὸν Κέφαλον might be read. Keeping in view the *two* defects indicated and believing λέγειν to be wrong as well as κεφαλὴν, I am inclined to put forward the somewhat bold suggestion that τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔχων λέγειν is nothing more than a gloss or explanation which has taken the place of some more striking expression. The poet might for instance very well write

ὑπὲρ ἐπιζήνου' θελήσω τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς δραμεῖν.

He uses this expression in *Wasps* 375, ποιήσω δακεῖν τὴν καρδίαν καὶ τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς δρόμον δραμεῖν. I add some other passages which illustrate the expression, and which illustrate also in some cases the ellipse of δρόμος or ἀγών: *Il.* 22. 161 περὶ ψυχῆς θέον Ἑκτορος ἱπποδάμιοιο: *Herod.* 7. 57. 2 περὶ ἑωυτοῦ τρέχων: 8. 74. 1 περὶ τοῦ παυτοῦ ἥδη δρόμον θέοντες: *ib.* 102. 4 πολλοὺς ἀγῶνας δραμεῖνται περὶ σφῆων αὐτῶν: 9. 37. 3 τρέχων περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς: *Eur. Phoen.* 1330 δοκῶ δ' ἀγῶνα τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς. Κρέον, ἥδη πεπραχθαί: *Xen. Mem.* 3. 12. 1 ὁ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ἀγών: *R.L.* 10. 2 κυρίου τοῦ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγῶνος: *de Re Eq.* 7. 11 a horse τὸν αὐτοφῶα (*i.e.* δρόμον or τρόχον) διατροχάζων: *Plat. Theaet.* 172 ε περὶ ψυχῆς ὁ δρόμος: *Polyb.* 18. 35. 6 εἰάν, τὸ δὲ λέγόμενον, τρέχωσι τὴν ἐσχάτην and so 1. 87. 3: *Zenob.* 4. 85 λαγῶς τὸν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν τρέχει: *Plut. Mor.* 1087 β τὴν περὶ τῶν κρεῶν ἐπάξει: *Dion. Hal. Isocr.* 12 τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς τρέχοντι κίνδυνον ἐν δικασταῖς: *Alciph.* 3. 72. 1 τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς ἀγῶνα ὑπέμειναν: *Philostr. Vit. Apollon.* δραμεῖσθαί τινα ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγῶνα. Cf. further the constant omission of δρόμος or ἀγών with such words as ὁ δόλιχος, ὁ ὀπλίτης, &c., e.g. *Laus* 833 α β ὁ τὸ στάδιον ἀμιλλασόμενος . . . δεῦτερος δὲ ὁ τὸν δίαυλον καὶ τρίτος ὁ τὸν ἐφίππιον καὶ δὴ καὶ τέταρτος ὁ τὸν δόλιχον: and in Aristophanes such elisions in other phrases as τιμᾶν τὴν μακράν, δικάσαι μίαν, ναυμαχῆσαι μίαν, ἐτέρων ἔχχειν, γεωργεῖν πολλήν.

In 481 below Dicaeopolis exclaims ὦ θύμ' . . . ἄρ' οἴσθ' ὅσον τὸν ἀγῶν' ἀγωνιεῖ τάχα, μέλλων ὑπὲρ Λακεδαιμονίων ἀνδρῶν λέγειν;

410 ΔΙΚ. Εὐριπίδῃ ΕΥΡ. τί λέλακας; ΔΙΚ.  
ἀναβάδην ποιεῖς,  
ἐξὸν καταβάδην; οὐκ ἐτὸς χλωρὸς  
ποιεῖς.  
ἀτὰρ τί τὰ ῥάκι' ἐκ τραγωδίας ἔχεις,  
ἐσθῆτ' ἑλενὴν; οὐκ ἐτὸς πτωχοὺς  
ποιεῖς.

The idea that ἀναβάδην here and in 399 means *upstairs* ought to be dismissed once

for all. (1) The sense *with the legs up* is established beyond any reasonable doubt by the occurrence of ἀναβάδην καθήσθαι in Plut. Mor. 336 c u.v. Wytttenbach: Dio Chrys. 62. p. 323: Athen. 528 f (all apparently taken from Ctesias): by Pollux' recognition of the phrases ἀναβάδην καθήμενος (3. 90) and ἀναβάδην καθίζειν 6. 175: and by the passage in Plutus 1123 where Hermes, now out of work, says νῦν δὲ πενῶν ἀναβάδην ἀναπαύομαι. The repeated junction with the idea of sitting really admits of no other interpretation, and the ἀναβάδην of Hermes emphasises the notion of inactivity. (2) On the other hand the sense *upstairs* is not established for any passage anywhere. It is true that a scholiast here says τὸ ἀναβάδην ἄνω τοὺς πόδας ἔχων ἐπὶ ὑψηλοῦ τόπου καθήμενος: and so Suidas ἀναβάδην· ἐφ' ὕψους ἄνω τοὺς πόδας ἔχειν καὶ κοιμᾶσθαι. These explanations at first sight seem to jumble the two suggested meanings together, unless indeed we are to put a stop before the ἐπὶ ὑψηλοῦ and the ἐφ' ὕψους respectively; but perhaps those phrases mean no more than the height, e.g. the couch, on which the feet rest. On Plut. 1123 the scholia say nothing of ὑψηλὸς τόπος: they give the alternatives of *legs up* and *feet crossed*. No passage elsewhere has yet been cited in which the meaning *upstairs* seems needed, and it is probable that the scholiasts had no more to go on than we have. (3) Euripides is evidently brought out by the eccyclema, and there is not the slightest reason for thinking that this or anything like it could be worked except on the ordinary level.

An eccyclema on the first floor is a thing unheard of. (4) The point of οὐκ ἐὼς χολοὺς ποιεῖς, *no wonder you bring in lame people*, is not the danger of falling down from an upper story. Why should adults be unable to take care of themselves? It is the suggestion of inability to walk conveyed by the reclining or half-reclining attitude. If the poet does not put down his own legs (καταβαίνειν 408: καταβάδην 411: cf. Phaedo 61 c) and get up, no wonder his characters can't use theirs.

Line 412 presents considerable difficulty to my mind. The meaning of course must be that his wearing rags himself accounts for the raggedness of his heroes, just as his not using his legs accounted for their being lame. But then the point of this is spoiled if he is said to wear *rags taken from tragedy*. The rags of tragedy should come from his own, not his own from tragedy. We must not go behind his rags and start with (1) ragged heroes, whose tatters he then (2) takes and wears, and therefore (3) naturally produces new heroes in rags. The joke is lost, if the thing does not *begin* with him. To avoid this, I have sometimes thought of writing εἰς τραγωδίαν for ἐκ τραγωδίας, ἐκ and εἰς being liable to confusion (EK, EIC), and taking it to mean 'to write tragedy in,' 'for tragedy.' But I am not very well satisfied with that.

549 Should we write

ἀσκούς, τροπωτήρας, κάδους ὠνούμενων?

HERBERT RICHARDS.

(To be continued.)

## NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE PARIAN MARBLE.—II.

AT line 46 we recover the assistance of the Marble itself, and can to some extent control the restoration of the text by vestiges of letters or measurement of gaps. Unfortunately the upper part of the Oxford fragment, especially the right hand corner, has suffered very severely even since Selden's time, and the centre of the lower part of the new Parian fragment is entirely obliterated.

It would be tedious to notice here all the small corrections to be made in the text by deciphering a few more letters already rightly supplied, or changing the divisions of lines. I confine these notes to more material alterations, except where it seems

desirable to confirm or confute a doubtful restoration.

If I am right in reverting to Selden and splitting up Boeckh's Ep. 76 into three, the number of *epochs* on the Arundel Marble will become 80. I have denoted the *epochs* of the new Parian fragment by the letters of the alphabet (a, b, c,—i and j, v and w counted as one), and when these run short by the same letters doubled (aa, bb, cc).

### II.

Ep. 30. Lines 45-47. 'Αφ' οὗ Φ[ε]δων ὁ Ἀργαῖος ἐδήμειν[ε τὰ μ]ε[τ]ρα, καὶ || σταθμὰ]

Α Α 2

κατεσκεύασε, καὶ νόμισμα ἀργυροῦν ἐν Αἰγίνῃ ἐποίησεν, κ.τ.λ.

Κατεσκεύασε is certain, and I fancy I can make out -αθμα. In any case σταθμά seems to be required by the verb. For the fact compare Strabo 358, quoting Ephorus.

Boeckh was betrayed by Forster's notes into reading ἀνεσκεύασε. He rejected σταθμά, which had been inserted by Prideaux and Chandler.

Ep. 31. Lines 47-48. We must restore Συρακοῦσας, for the name is spelt with σσ wherever it is preserved on the Marble. So too [Συρακουσσών] must be read in Ep. 53.

Ep. 32. Line 48. Ἡρξεν is distinctly legible. Boeckh has ἦρ[χ]εν.

Ep. 33. Lines 48-49. The substance of this epoch is lost, and there is not sufficient material for a restoration, although Baumgarten's suggestion, that Archilochus was mentioned, is plausible. But the dating clause is preserved—ἔτη ΗΗΗΗΔΠΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι ΛΥΣΙΑ. Now Pausanias (IV, 15, 1) says according to the received text that in the 4th year of the 23rd Olympiad Ἀθηναίους Τληπόας ἦρχεν. And Palmerius, objecting to the genitive Λυσία, suggested that Τληπόας might be substituted. Boeckh was ready to swallow the genitive as a Parian form, but adopted the suggestion Τληπόας, suspecting that Selden had misread the letters. But Selden's reading is confirmed by vestiges of ΛΥΣ still visible on the stone, and, even granting that Pausanias intended the same archon, we might argue that Pausanias is to be corrected by the Marble (as Lydiat hinted) rather than the Marble by Pausanias. Selden's reading however appears to be incomplete. ΛΥΣΙΑ will not fill the space before the Αφ' οὗ which follows. There is room for about three letters more. I propose therefore to read Λυσία[δου], and get rid of the anomalous genitive.

Ep. 34. Lines 49-50. Ἀφ' οὗ Τέρπανδρος ὁ Δερδένης ὁ Λέσβιος τοὺς νόμους ΤΟΥ . . . Α . . . ΩΝ . . . Δ . . . ΟΥΣΘΑΙΑΥΛΗΤ . . . || . . . ΑΗΣΕ καὶ τὴν ἔμπροσθε μουσικὴν μετέστησεν, ἔτη η] κ.τ.λ.

The end of line 49, from about νο in νόμους, has been broken off since Selden's copy was made, and I do not believe that Forster's collator ever saw it. At the beginning of line 50 there is rather more room than Selden allowed, but nothing can

now be read for certain before καί. Boeckh restores on the model of Palmerius τοὺς νόμους τοῦ[ς] κιθ[α]ρ[ωδ]ῶν [ἐδὲ]δ[α]ξεν, οὗς [κ]αὶ αὐλητ[ῆς] συν-||-ἡν[α]λυσεν. But his restoration seems forced, and the relative clause particularly inept. Perhaps τοὺς νόμους τοῦ[ς] τῶν π[α]λαιῶν [ἐπανορθ]οῦσθαι αὐλητ[ῶν] || ἐτόλμ[η]σεν might stand. Αὐλητῶν would be in antithesis to Terpander, the κιθαρωδός.

Ep. 36. Lines 51-52. The double σ in Συρακοῦσας is plainly legible. There seems to be just enough room for [γεω]μόρων, although it is a tight fit and the letters are gone.

Ep. 38. Lines 53-54. Boeckh's insertion of [ἐν Δελ-||-φοῖς] is unnecessary. Line 54 began with στεφανίτης. Ν is to be added to Ἀθήνησι.

Ep. 39. Lines 54-56. Ἀφ' οὗ ἐν Ἀθ[ῆν]αις κομω[δ]ῶν χο[ρ]ῶς ἡρ[π]έθη [στη]σαν[τ-||-ων] πρώ[τ]ων Ἰκαριέων, εὐρόντος Σουσαρίωνος, καὶ ἄλλον ἐτίθη πρώτων ισχάδω[ν] ἀρσιχο[ρ]ῶν καὶ οἶνον με[τ-||-ρη]τῆς, ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

Boeckh has [στη]σαν[τ]ων αὐ-||-τὸν τῶν Ἰκαριέων. But in the first place Selden evidently took his ΣΑΝΙ to be the end of line 54, for he put no dots after it, and the stone seems to confirm him.<sup>1</sup> Secondly the article before Ἰκαριέων is contrary to the usual practice of the Marble.<sup>2</sup>

After ΟΙΝΟΥ Selden has . . . ΕΡ. . . . ΟΣ . . . ., which may be variously interpreted. Bentley (Phal. 209) restored οἶνον ἀμφορέως from Plutarch, de cupid. divit. 8, and is followed by Boeckh, who takes Selden's ΕΡ to represent ΕΥ, and ΟΣ to be the end of ἄρχοντος. Perhaps ΕΡ may only be ΕΤ in ἔτη, but I think I can read ΜΕ . Ρ after οἶνον, which would give μετρητῆς, and Selden may have read the Ε and the Ρ but missed the Τ between them.

Ep. 41. Lines 56-57. Ἀφ' οὗ Κροίσος [ἐξ] Ἀσίας [εἰς] Δελφοῦ[ς] Α . . . || [ἔτη ΗΗ||] ΔΔΔΔΙΙ, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι Ν ΕΥΘΥδήμων.

The Ν at the end of Ἀθήνησιν and the archon's name, which had been correctly

<sup>1</sup> The right edge of the stone is a little less hopelessly disintegrated than most of the right upper corner, and I fancy I can detect ΣΑΝ in spite of Dr. Mill (Bentley, Phal. 207).

<sup>2</sup> And therefore I suspect its insertion before Ἀθηναίους in Ep. 19.

elicited from Selden's ΤΟΥΔΗΜΟΥ,<sup>1</sup> are legible on the stone.

Most editors have supplied ἀπέστειλεν in the lacuna, and Boeckh fancying that the line was shorter than its neighbours hazards the suggestion ἀπέστειλεν Αἰσωπον μαντευόμενον. I think that what was foremost in the chronicler's mind was rather the offerings of Croesus than his envoys. I should supply ἀπέπεμψε τὰ ἀναθήματα. Compare Herod. I, 14 and 51. The shortness of the line is largely illusory, and due to Selden's having written .1 to represent the whole word Ἀθήνησι.

Ep. 42. Lines 57-58. 'Αφ' οὗ Κῦρος ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεὺς Σάρδεϊς ἔλαβε καὶ Κροῖσον ΥΠΟ . . . . . ΗΞΣΦΑΛ . . . . . κ.τ.λ.

Boeckh following the lead of Palmerius reads ὑπὸ [Πυθία]ς σφαλί[ε]ντα ἐξώγρησεν, ἔτη ΗΗ<sup>2</sup>ΔΔΓΠΙΙ, ἄρχοντας Ἀθήνησι . . . ἦν || δέ] καὶ Ἰππῶναξ κ.τ.λ. But this supplement expands line 57 to the outrageous length of something like 150 letters. The simplest remedy would be to omit ἐξώγρησεν, for the chronicler uses the word ἔλαβε of persons as well as places (cf. line 7 of the new fragment), or possibly ὑπο[πρ]ήσ[α]ς [ἡ]φά[νισεν] would not be too far from the text.

Ep. 43. Lines 58-59. Boeckh's restoration runs 'Αφ' οὗ Θέσπις ὁ ποιητῆς [ἐφάνη], πρῶτος ὃς ἐδίδαξε [δρ]ῶμα ἐν ᾧ στ[ε]ι, καὶ ἐ[τ]έθη ὁ [τ]ράγος [ἄθλον], ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

It is difficult to fit this version to the traces on the stone, but it is equally difficult to suggest another. One point however may be noted. Dr. Mill's πρῶτος ὃς (v. Bentley Phal. 240), whether right or wrong, is easily recognisable, and the Π is particularly distinct. But ἐφάνη would only fill half the space between ποιητῆς and πρῶτος. Moreover the word seems to me to savour of the Heroic age and to be inapplicable to a poet so late as Thespis. There is a wide field for conjecture, but I fancy the vestiges give a slight preference to a word ending in -το or perhaps -ατο.

Ep. 44. Line 59. The stone supports ἐβασίλευσε against ἐβασίλευε, and does not preclude reading Π for ΙΙΙ in the numeral.

<sup>1</sup> I believe that a similar misreading underlies the curious passage at the beginning of the forty-first chapter of the Aristotelian Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, where the writer, or his authority, is thinking of the archon Euthydemus who succeeded Pythodorus in the year 431, and we ought to read δοκοῦντος δὲ δικαίως τοῦ δῆμου (i.e. originally Εὐθυδήμου) λαβεῖν τὴν [ἐκ]ωνυμίαν κ.τ.λ.

Ep. 45. Lines 59-61. 'Αφ' οὗ Ἀρμόδιος καὶ [Ἀριστογέ]ιτων ἀπέκτε[ιναν] || Ἰππαρχον Πεισιστράτου / . . Δ . . ΟΝ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι κ.τ.λ. After Πεισιστράτου Selden has A . . . . . ΟΝ. I give the letters as I should read them on the stone. The supplement Ἀ[θηνῶν] τύραν[ον], adopted by Boeckh from Prideaux, is much too long. Perhaps [τύρ]α[νν]ον might stand, but the traces rather favour [διὰ]δ[οχ]ον.

The name of the archon according to Ἀθ. πολ. 19 was Ἀρπακτίδης, and the traces on the marble point to Ἀθήνησι Ν Α[Ρ]Π[ακτίδου].

Ep. 46. Line 61. Boeckh gives the date as ἔτη ΞΗΗΔΔΔΔ[ΙΙΙΙ], ἄρχοντας Ἀθήνησιν [Ἰ]σαγόρου. I should read ΠΙ on the stone for ΙΙΙΙ, and ΑΥΣαγόρου is quite plain. If the chronicler intended Isagoras and the year 508 one would expect Π (245). ΠΙ ought to mean the year 509, and we do not know the archon of that year. He may have been named Lysagoras, or the chronicler may have put Isagoras in 509, or the marks on the stone may be deceptive.

Ep. 47. Lines 61-62. Selden has 'Αφ' οὗ ΝΕ . . . . . ΙΠΠΙΑ . . . . . || . . . ΕΝ Ἀθήνησιν, ἔτη κ.τ.λ., out of which Boeckh spins a yarn about an imaginary Nestor, or Neileus, son of Hippias, who may have been caught in a plot to bring back the tyrant and put to death. I should read ΜΕ rather than ΝΕ, and have little doubt that we have to restore Με[λαν]ιππί[δης] . . . . . || ἐνέκ[η]σεν Ἀθήνησιν. After Μελανιππίδης I see Μ, which naturally suggests Μ[ήλιος], and although it is not easy to fit into the space I think this suggestion is the most probable, and preferable to μέλι for example. With Ἰππία disappears the last of Boeckh's Parian forms.

Ep. 48. Lines 62-64. 'Αφ' οὗ ἡ ἐμ. Μαραθῶνι μάχῃ ἐγένετο Ἀθηναῖους πρὸς τοὺς Πέρσας Ἀρ[ταφρένα] τὸν Δαρείου ἀδελ[φ]οῦν καὶ Δᾶτιν τὸν στρατηγόν, ἦν ἐνίκων Ἀθηναῖοι, ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

The interval shown in Selden's copy between Πέρσας and Ἀρ[ταφρένα] does not exist, so we cannot insert [καί]. On the other hand there is more room than Selden allows at the beginning of line 63. I have given the obvious restoration, but I fear it is 2 or 3 letters too long for the space, and suspect that we must either read καὶ Δᾶτ[ρ]ι or



στρατηγόν, or allow that the chronicler has confused father and son and restore ἀδελ[φ]-ὸν καὶ Δᾶτι]. The ἦν before ἐνίκων is on the stone, as Boeckh rightly inferred from Forster's notes.

Ep. 49. Lines 64-65. Boeckh wrongly inserted Περσῶν after βασιλεύει, where there is no room for it and the Ε of ἔτη is still legible. Selden notes that the numeral may be read as either ΗΗΔ]ΔΓ or ΔΓΙ. The stone rather favours the latter, and we should expect 226, because the chronicler normally puts the archons before the year 399 one year above their orthodox dates. There seems to be no Ν at the end of Ἀθήνησι.

Ep. 50. Lines 65-66. Add ὁ between Στρασίχορος and ποιητής, as Boeckh desired.

Ep. 52. Lines 67-69. The last clause ought to run καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἐρήν εἶν || Σι]κελία περὶ τὴν Αἰτνῆν. Selden mistook the Ε in ἐν for Κ, and left too much space at the beginning of line 69. There was therefore a natural tendency to look for ἐρρύηκεν, which Palmerius suggested, or ἐρρύη as in the parallel passage of Thucydides (III. 116). I imagine that Forster's collator approached the marble with the expectation of seeing PP, and that his eye fell upon ΕΡΜΟ (in Θερμοπύλαις) exactly above ΕΡΥΗ two lines higher up, which in the present condition of the stone is at first sight most deceptively like ΕΡΡΥ. Hence the pencil note in Forster's margin 'ΕΡΡΥΗΚ,' and the subsequent correction in ink 'ΕΡΥΗΚ recte.' But Boeckh was misled into reading ἐρρύη κῶν || ἐν Σικελίᾳ. Chandler seems to have looked at the stone, for he suggests ἐρήνησε, mistaking Ε for Σ, and omits the Κ. The stone confirms Boeckh's Αἰτνῆν for Αἰτνίαν.

Ep. 54. Lines 70-71. There is no Ν at the end of the first Ἀθήνησι. One would rather restore 214 than 213 for the numeral (see note on Ep. 49), but it is a tight fit. So also Ep. 60, etc.

Ep. 55. Lines 71-72. The ΣΣ in Συρακουσσῶν is plain. So too Ep. 62.

Ep. 56. Line 72. Ἀψηφίωνος is clearly legible, not -ονος.

Ep. 59. Lines 74-75. ΕΓ is clearly legible, not ΕΝ.

Ep. 63. Lines 77-78. Ἀθήνησι, not Ἀθήνησιν.

Ep. 64. Lines 78-79. The stone clearly gives 92, not 91, for the age of Sophocles at the time of his death.

As to the archon, Καλλίου τοῦ ΠΡΟ. ΕΡΟΥ is plainly legible, but as προτέρου is evidently repeated from Ep. 59 by one of those slips of which we have seen an example in Ep. 27, it does not necessarily follow that we must read δευτέρου here and not τρίτου, although the former is perhaps the easier and more natural.

Ep. 66. Lines 79-80. Surely [κατῆλθον, rather than [επανῆλθον, οἱ || μετ]ὰ Κύρον ἀναβάντες would be the natural word. The stone confirms the Α before Κύρον. I cannot see Ο between Σωκράτης and φιλόσοφος, and there does not appear to be any room for it.

Ep. 67. Lines 80-81. Ἀφ' οὗ Ἀρ[ι]στ[ο]τέλης ἐνίκη[σεν] Ἀθήνησιν, ἔτη ΗΔΔΔΓ, ἄρχοντας Ἀθήνησιν Ἀριστοκράτους.

I read ΑΡ[ι]ΣΤ[ο] or ΑΡ[ι]ΣΤ[Α], the last letter might be either. Chandler gives ΑΓ, Forster ΑΙ. Chandler restored Ἀ[στυ]δάμας πρῶτον ἐδίδαξεν, (cf. Diod. Sic. XIV. 43), which Boeckh accepted with the qualification 'valde incertum supplementum.' There were many poets with names in Aristoliving about the time, but I know no evidence to connect any one of them with a victory, probably a first victory, in the year 399-8.

Ep. 68. Lines 81-82. Ἀφ' οὗ Π[ολύ]ιδος Σηλυμβριανὸς διδυράμβωι ἐνίκησεν Ἀθήνησιν, ἔτη κ.τ.λ.

ΥΙΔΟΣ is certain and Π very probable. There can be no doubt that Πολύιδος is right. The date is lost, but the limits 399 to 380 cover the acme of Polyidus, and a reference to him would be in every way appropriate. I cannot see how Chandler arrived at Ξ, or Forster's collator at Ο, for Π. Σηλυμβριανὸς had already been reached by Flach, but as applied to Polyidus it appears to give us a new fact. Baumgarten guessed Polyidus (or Timotheus), but met with little attention.

Ep. 71. Line 83. Ἀφ' οὗ Ἀστυδάμας Ἀθήνησιν ἐνίκησεν, ἔτη ΗΓΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντας Ἀθήνησιν Ἀστέιον κατεκάη δὲ τότε ΚΑ[ ]].

Boeckh, like his predecessors, followed the cue suggested by Aristotle Meteor. I. 6 and Diodorus XV. 50, and restored κατεκάη δὲ τότε κα[τὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἢ πυρίνη δοκίς]. The



suggestion was plausible, but, I believe, illusory. *Κατεῶν*, which is quite clear on the stone, is a very strange word to use of a comet, as Dopp felt when he attempted to resolve it into *καὶ ἐκάη*. But a more natural restoration is ready to hand. A fourth century inscription of Delphi (Homolle in Bull. de Corr. hell. XX. p. 679, Dittenberger no. 93, who give further references) alludes to the destruction of the temple there in the words *ἐπ[εὶ] ὁ ναὸς κατ[εκα]-ύθη*. M. Homolle argues that there is only room for two letters after *κατ*, and therefore rejects *κατ[εκα]ύθη*, which had been originally proposed by Schmidt, Pomtow, and Dittenberger. But it is obvious from the photograph which he publishes that there is no physical impossibility in supplying the three letters—they would only be a little crowded. On the other hand the year of Asteius, 373, is the very year fixed upon by M. Homolle for the destruction of the temple, and when we put the Parian Marble, which records the *burning down* of something in the year 373, beside the Delphic inscription, we can hardly refuse to interpret them in the light of one another, and read in the one case *ἐπ[εὶ] ὁ ναὸς κατ[εκα]ύθη*, and in the other *κατεῶν δὲ τότε καὶ ὁ ἐν Δελφοῖς ναὸς*.

This is not the place for a detailed discussion of the archaeological and other evidence as to the destruction of the Delphic temple. A full and lucid account of the problem will be found in M. Homolle's admirable paper, and I am aware of the objections which may be brought against my suggestion. But I hold that the burden of proof has now been shifted on to those who would deny that the temple was *burnt down*, and that evidence which might suffice to set aside statements of Macrobius or 'Epaphus' will not be conclusive against the convergent testimony of the two inscriptions.

Boeckh rejected 'istud καὶ' but it is adequately supported by parallel cases in lines 13, 15, and 18 of the new fragment.

*Ep. 72. Lines 83–85.* After Φρασικλείδου Forster's notes add ΚΑΙΟΑΑ'. . . Α (καὶ ὁ 'ΑΛ[έξανδρος κ.τ.λ.]). The traces on the stone favour the omission of the O, which Boeckh wished away. I do not feel confident that the collator really read all the letters.

*Ep. 73. Line 85.* The stone has 'ΙμερΔιος for 'Ιμεραῖος.

*Ep. 74. Lines 86–87.* I should restore Περδίκκας ὁ 'Αμύντων in place of Προλεμαῖος ὁ 'Αλωρίτης. Ptolemy was not the legitimate

sovereign, and there is no room for a notice of Perdiccas' accession before Ep. 77 (76), which certainly referred to Philip.

*Ep. 75. Lines 87–88.* 'Αφ' οὗ Φωκεῖς τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς μα[ντεῖον κατέλαβον], ἔτη ΗΙΙ, ἄρχοντας 'Αθήνῃ||-νησι Κηφισοδώρου.

After Δελφοῖς Forster's notes have IPON, which is suspiciously like a conjecture, although Dopp seems to have persuaded himself that he could see the P on the squeeze. I should read MA on the stone, which gives μα[ντεῖον]. Κατέλαβον, which Boeckh retained from Baumgarten, is probably right, but not long enough to fill the whole space. ΚηφισοΔΑΡΟΝ is plainly legible.

The restoration of the date raises a difficult question. The year of Kephisodorus is according to the accepted list 366–5 B.C., or by the reckoning of the Marble ἔτη ΗΙΙ. But all historical authority puts the seizure of Delphi in or about the year of Agathocles, 357–6. And the archon before Agathocles was, according to the received authorities, named Kephisodotus. Lydiat, Prideaux, Chandler, Clinton, and Boeckh therefore suppose that the name Kephisodorus was either an alternative reading in the lists for the archon of 358–7, or a mistake of the chronicler's (or mason's) for Kephisodotus, and restore the numeral 94. But this solution, however plausible at first sight, leads to serious difficulties. It is only made possible by the desperate expedient of throwing the whole of the next two and a half lines, from Αφ' οὗ Τιμόθεος down to ἄρχοντας 'Αθήνησιν Ἀγαθοκλέους, into one epoch, in defiance of the usages of the Marble and historical probability. Admitting, therefore, that a confusion between the two archons lies at the root of the blunder, I prefer to think with Palmerius and Müller that the chronicler has thrust back the seizure of Delphi to the year 366 simply to suit the name Kephisodorus. Boeckh could not believe that he could be guilty of an error of eight years or more, but Boeckh seems to me to have misconceived the method of the compiler, who is not (I take it) composing a chronological abstract of Greek history, political and literary, but having made a collection of historical facts, which he could by literary or monumental evidence connect with certain archons (or reigns), he arranges them in chronological sequence and calculates their dates from the list of archons. In other words the archon gives the evidence

for the numeral, not the numeral for the archon. This procedure would, I think, go far to explain the apparently arbitrary selection of the facts recorded. They are those facts about which the compiler happened to have the required information at hand.

*Epp. 76, 77, 78. Lines 88-90.* (76) 'Αφ' οὐ Τιμόθεος βιώσας ἔτη [ΔΔΔΔ ἐτελεύτησεν, ἔτη] ἄρχοντας 'Αθηνησι [ ]. (77) ['Αφ' οὐ Φίλιππος ὁ 'Αμύντου Μα]-[κεδόνων βασιλεύει, καὶ 'Αρτοξέρξης ἐτελεύτησεν, Ὄρχος δὲ ὁ υἱὸς β[ασιλεύει, ἔτη] [ΔΔΔΔΓ, ἄρχοντας 'Αθήνησι Καλλιμάδους]. (78) ['Αφ' οὐ 'Αθήνη-[-σαν] ἐνίκησεν, ἔτη [ΔΔΔΔΙΙΙ, ἄρχοντας 'Αθήνησιν 'Αγαθοκλέους.

All those who date Ep. 75 at 358 B.C. are obliged to combine these three *epochs* into one. Instead of the natural ἔτη Boeckh restores ἐτ[ελεύτησεν δὲ καὶ Περδίκκας κ.τ.λ., a form of expression which never occurs on the Marble except *after the date*, where a supplement or postscript is tacked on at the end of an *epoch*. Secondly there are grave historical objections to setting the accession of Philip and of Ochus in the year of Agathocles, 357. Thirdly it is singular to find the accession of the kings sandwiched in between two literary notices; for ἐνίκησεν probably refers to an agonistic not a military victory, not merely on a simple enumeration of the instances, but also because no very famous battle was fought in the year of Agathocles, and because, where the word ἐνίκησεν ends a clause in the chronicle, it always does refer to a literary or musical contest. Lastly the length of the combined *epoch* is suspicious, although not beyond all parallel.

For ΙΙΙ in the last numeral Forster's notes give ΙΙ, which is certainly all that can now be read, but the two strokes are rather wide apart, and faint traces on the stone between them may indicate a lost third, and although it is hard to account for the obliteration of this middle stroke while the others remain distinctly legible, yet its former existence seems sufficiently attested by Selden and Chandler and the orthodoxy of this part of the Marble in its dates for the archons.

Περσῶν after β[ασιλεύει is unnecessary, cf. Ep. 49.

*Ep. 79. Lines 90-92.* Nothing is left before the date except ἐ]γένετο. I do not believe in Boeckh's ὁ πρὸς τοὺς Φωκεῖς πόλεμος. And the date is one year too late for the

birth of Alexander, which was first suggested by Prideaux.

At the beginning of line 92 are some remnants of what was evidently a postscript after the archon's name. Selden has . . . . ΣΟΦΟΣ . . . . Τ . . . ΤΟΥΤΟΥ, which is more like the spacing than Chandler's version. Forster's collator estimated 9 letters before ΟΥΤΟΥ. I should read . . . Σ . . . . ΕΥΤΟΥ. The letter before Σ looks like Α or Η, and the letters next after Σ suggest ΑΓΩ or ΑΜ rather than Σ[ΟΦΟΣ.

*Ep. 80. Lines 92-93.* Nothing certain can now be made out after 'Αφ' οὐ. Selden has ΚΑ, Forster ΚΑΑΑΙ . . . . ΓΤ, which suggests Κάλλιππος, or was perhaps suggested by it, for Lydiat and Prideaux had already made the conjecture. Line 93 has now been broken away and totally lost.

### III.

*Epp. a and b. Lines 1-2.* It is tempting to restore the traces in the first line to ἄρχοντας 'Αθηνησι Χαυρών]δο[ν, referring Ep. a to the battle of Chaeronea, and starting Ep. b in line 1. But it is not easy to adjust this restoration to the marks.

*Ep. k. Lines 9-10.* 'Απὸ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ γενομένου ΠΕΡΙ [ ] ΛΑΜΙΑΝ 'Αθηναίους πρὸς 'Αντίπατρον κ.τ.λ.

Between περὶ and Λαμίαν is an erasure which might contain either *two* broad letters, or *three* narrow ones such as Ι, Ρ, or Υ. The traces on the stone point to two broad letters, of which the first seems to have had an horizontal top stroke, and the second was certainly Α or Λ or Δ. The two last letters of Λαμίαν are engraved over a second erasure, and the letter which originally stood in place of the Α was a 'square' letter with two vertical strokes. I believe that the cutter originally wrote ΣΑΛΑΜΙΝΑ, and then corrected it to ΛΑΜΙΑΝ by erasing the first two letters and changing the last two.

*Ep. s. Lines 20-21.* The Σ in 'Αθήνησι and ΣΙ in Σίμωνίδου are visible, and the space between them shows that we must read 'Αθήνησιν.

*Ep. t. Lines 21-22.* The first letter after the gap appears to be certainly Γ, but I do

not feel sure that there is not room for an E between it and [ἐτη].

*Ep. v. Lines 22-24.* 'Οφέλας [ε]ίς [Κ]αρχηδόνα στρατεύσας ἐτελεύτησεν, rather than μεταβὰς ἀνηρέθη, seems the natural restoration, unless Wilhelm has any reason to the contrary. Cf. *Ep. m.*, line 12.

I could not make out on the stone the letters ΣΛΙ read by Wilhelm on a squeeze.

*Ep. γ. Lines 25-26.* One might feel tempted to restore φ[υ]λ[αί] π[ρὸς] ταῖς δέκα προσετέθησαν Ἀθήνησιν ἐπώνυμοι Ἀντιγόνου καὶ Δημητρίου, cf. *Diod. xx. 46*, *Plut. Demetr. 10*, but the stone refuses any other reading than ΦΙΛΛΓ. Either Λ might be Α, but I doubt the point which Wilhelm marks before Π, where I take the scratch to be accidental.

Near the middle of the lacuna, about under ΑΣΤ in Θεοφράστου, I thought I could detect ON, and in the third place before ΟΥ something like Σ.

*Ep. z. Line 27.* Ἀφ' οὗ Σωσιφάνης ὁ ποιητής [ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ. Assuming that ἐγένετο is right, (ΕΓΕΝ is hard to distinguish from ΕΤΕΛΙ, ἐτελ[εύτησεν]), we have here the birth of a younger Sosiphanes, having already had the death of an elder in *Ep. q.*, lines 18-19. It is curious that nobody ever heard of two before the discovery of this part of the Marble. There was, to be sure, considerable uncertainty as to the date of Sosiphanes, for the notice of him in *Suidas* is evidently confused or corrupt, and his claim to a place in 'the Pleiad' is not a very strong one (v. *Clinton Fast. Hell. III p. 502*). Wilhelm suggests that a confusion

between the two poets may have contributed to muddle the accounts. But perhaps it is not impossible that there was after all only one Sosiphanes, that he died in the year 313, and that he was wrongly reckoned among the Seven Stars. *Sosithus* has a better claim to a place in the Pleiad, and possibly the engraver may have here repeated Σωσιφάνης from line 18, instead of writing Σωσίθεος, just as he repeated Μενεσθέως τρεῖςκαὶδεκάτου ἔτους in *Ep. 27*, and Καλλίου τοῦ προτέρου in *Ep. 64*.

*Ep. aa and bb. Lines 27-29.* In line 28 the vestiges before the gap might be read as Π . Π . Α . Β . . Ξ . Η, and in the third place before the Ν after the gap there appears to be something like Ο. These readings only confirm Wilhelm's ingenious restoration.

*Ep. cc. Lines 29-30.* Ἀφ' οὗ || [κομήτης] ἀστὴρ ἐφ[άνη] κ.τ.λ. Wilhelm goes to Chinese records for confirmation of his convincing restoration. I see no reason why this should not be the star seen by Philochorus and mentioned in his ninth book, vide *Dionys. Halic., Dinarch. 3*, p. 637, where the two quotations need not refer to consecutive years.

*Ep. dd. Lines 30-31.* In line 31 I should read the two strokes marked by Wilhelm under ΗΡ as Ν, and ΚΑΣ-ΣΑΝ . ΡΟ seems to be certain.

*Ep. ee. Lines 32-33.* The number 35 in line 33 is certain, for there is an appreciable vacant space, which was never inscribed, between the Γ and the edge of the stone.

J. ARTHUR R. MUNRO.

## NOTES.

NOTE ON SOPH. FRAGM. 626.—With this fragment—the isolated line

ἀλλ' ἔσθ' ὁ θάνατος λῶσθαι ἰατρὸς νόσων—

may be compared the Welsh proverb *nid iach ond a fo marw*, or *Death alone brings healing* (word for word: *not whole but who is dead*). The sentiment embodied for Englishmen, once for all, in the great line

After life's fitful fever he sleeps well,

is no doubt common to all languages because common to all peoples. But the Welsh parallel will probably be new to most readers of the *Classical Review*. With it may be coupled another striking proverb, in which the reference is to the impartiality of Death: *ni edrych awgwr pwy decaf ei dalcen*, or *Death cares not*

*whose forehead is the fairest* (lit. *not looks Death who fairest his forehead*).

A few Welsh and Greek proverbs are, I may perhaps be allowed to add, brought together for comparison on p. 38 of *Chapters on the Aims and Practice of Teaching*, edited by Professor F. Spencer; and a popular collection of Welsh proverbs, with English verse renderings, is accessible in H. H. Vaughan's *British Reason in English Rhyme*. A science (if science it could ever become) of Comparative Paroemiography, or International Folk-Wisdom, would possess great interest. But bold will be of παροιμιαζόμενοι who venture to grapple with so vast and vague a theme.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

\* \* \*

## PLAUTINUM, PERSA 777-8.

*Qui sunt qui erunt quique fuerunt quique futuri sunt posthac, solus ego omnibus antideo facile, miserrimus hominum ut vivam.*

Pro vocabulis *qui erunt*, quae utpote corrupta iam ab aliis (cf. Leo) notata sunt, nobis videtur scribendum esse *miseri*, ut locus se habeat:

*Qui sunt miseri quique fuerunt quique futuri sunt posthac, solus ego omnibus antideo facile, miserrimus hominum ut vivam.*

Vocabulum *miseri* desideratur in sententia: *qui sunt quique fuerunt quique futuri sunt posthac, solus ego omnibus antideo facile*,—deest aliquid, quod opus est memorari, dico *miseri* (*qui sunt miseri...*) vel *miseria* (*solus ego omnibus antideo miseria*); neque facile ex sequente superlativo (*miserrimus hominum ut vivam*) positivum *miseri* vel substantivum *miseria* εἰς ἀναλόγον intellegas. Locum, quos critici laudare solent, aut praepositum superlativum habent: Catull. 49, 1: *Disertissime Romuli nepotum, quot sunt, quotque fuere...quotque post alii serunt in annis*: Cic. Fam. xi, 21, 1: *Dei isti Segulio male faciant, homini nequissimo omnium qui sunt, qui fuerunt, qui futuri sunt*:—aut substantivum additum, quod ostendat, quia in re ille ceteros anteit: Cic. ad Quir. 16: *vir omnium qui sunt, fuerunt, erunt, virtute, sapientia, gloria princeps* (= omnes anteiens). Longe autem dissimilis loci Plautini est ille Xenophontis (Conv. 2, 10): *χρῆ γυναικὶ τῶν οὐσῶν, οἷμαι δὲ καὶ τῶν γεγεννημένων καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων χαλεπώτατῃ*; in hoc enim loco adiectivum *χαλεπώτατῃ* est praedicatum in eadem sententia (*χρῆ γυναικὶ χαλεπώτατῃ*...). In Bacch. 1087 sq. non modo substantivum additum est, sed etiam positiva praeposita: *Quicumque ubi ubi sunt, qui fuerunt, quique futuri sunt posthac stulti, stolidi, fatui, fungi, bardii, blenni, buccones, solus ego omnis longe antideo stultitia et moribus indoctis*.<sup>1</sup>

THEOPHANES KAKRIDIS.

Athenis.

\* \* \*

ELISION IN THE DIAERESIS OF THE PENTAMETER OF CATULLUS.—The joining together of the two hemistichs of the pentameter was contrary to the nature of the verse, and, as is well known, was avoided by the Latin poets. But three exceptions have been cited (Lucil., cf. Mart. xi. 90, 4; Prop. i. 5, 32; iii. (iv), 22, 10, and Cat.). For Catullus the authorities vary, Christ (Metr.<sup>2</sup> p. 207) citing no passages, Gleditsch (Metr. d. Röm.<sup>2</sup> § 185) but 2, as also Luc. Mueller (Re Metr.<sup>2</sup> p. 362, p. 271), and Havet-Duvan (Metr. Grec et Lat. § 142) citing 3. Plessis (Metr. Grec et Lat. § 123), however, gives a more complete list, citing 11 examples, as follows: 67, 44; 68, 10; 68<sup>b</sup>, 42 et 50; 73, 6; 77, 4; 90, 4; 97, 2; 101, 4; 68<sup>b</sup>, 16; and 99, 12.

To this list the following are to be added:

- (1) 71, 6: *Illam addigit odore, ipse perit podagra.*
- (2) 75, 4: *Nec desistere amare, omnia si faciat.*
- (3) 91, 10: *Culpast, in quacumque est aliquid sceleris.*
- (4) 95, 2: *Quam coepstas nonamque edita post hiemem.*

EMORY B. LEASE.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> The priority in this emendation is due to Schoell: but Dr. Kakridis' defence of it will be welcome to readers of the *C.R.*—Ed. *C.R.*

## ON PHAEDRUS IV. VII. 17 sqq.

Quid tibi videtur? 'Hoc quoque insulsum est' ais falsoque dictum, longe quia vetustior Aegaea Minos classe perdomuit freta iustoque vindicavit exemplo timperium.

To *impium*, my emendation of the corruption in v. 20, it has been justly objected that this acc. with *vindicare* in the sense of 'punishing' is without example.<sup>2</sup> The change of a single letter in it, however, will set this right and at the same time bring it still nearer to the MSS. For *impium* (imperium) we have only to read *impium*. *Impium* is a neuter substantive, the equivalent of *impietatem* and the opposite of *pium*=*pietas* (Ovid A.A. 1, 200 'iusque piumque'). So *iniustum* Hor. S. 1, 3, 111 'metu iniusti,' *inhumanum*=*inhumanitatem*, Plautus, Rud. 767. The use of *impudens*=*ἀναδela* in 620 is remarkable enough to quote: 'statuite exemplum *impudenti*, date *pudori* praemium.' I have given several examples of this use of the neuter as an abstract, as it is often illustrated from passages where it does not occur; e.g. in Hor. Carm. 3, 30, 12 'ex humili potens' 'humili' is masculine.

The reference is to the unnatural conduct of Scylla to her father Nisus and her condign punishment by Minos. In the face of Propertius 3, 19, 21-28 and especially the last two lines 'non tamen immerito Minos sedet arbiter Orci: uictor erat quamvis, aecus in hoste fuit' the allusion cannot be regarded as farfetched. But if it were, this would make no difference, as Phaedrus is professedly quoting from an unreasonable critic.

J. P. POSTGATE.

\* \* \*

EXCUSATOR IN SALVIANUS.—In Salvianus de gubernatione Dei III § 54 we read: quis enim vel nobilium omnino vel divitum horrens crimina? quamvis in hoc fefellerim; multi enim horrent, sed paucissimi horrent in aliis quippe horrent, quod in se semper admittunt, mirum in modum et accusatores eorum criminum et excusatores.

Throughout the whole passage the contrast is drawn between the severe judgement passed by the great on their neighbours' failings and their blindness to their own misdeeds; *non videmus manticae quod in tergo est*. They are *accusatores* eorum criminum (in aliis), *excusatores* (in se); cf. Hor. Sat. I 3 25-28.

Halm retains *excusatores* in his text, but gives it no place in his index. Pauly (Vienna 1883) has unfortunately admitted into the text a manifest corruption (*exsecutores*) in deference to Hartel, to whom his edition is dedicated. His critical note is: 'exsecutores *Hartelini* (propter *sqq.* quod occulte agant).' In the text (line 16) Pauly reads *agunt*, not *agant*, but let that pass. Salvianus is as fond as is Augustine of alliteration (thus in book vii §§ 12 and 70 *divitiis* and *vitiis*). Forcellini (s.v. *excusator*) cites from Augustine the same juxtaposition of *accusator* and *excusator*; compare Rom. 2 15 and the proverb, *qui s'excuse, s'accuse*. Salvianus himself contrasts the verbs: ad eocl. iv. § 46: *quicumque sibi se excusat accusat Deo*. The great Latin lexicon now in course of publication gives under *accusator* among contrasted words (*opposita*) *deprecator*, but not *excusator*. Under the latter word this passage of Salvianus may find, let us hope, a place side by side with that from Augustine.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

<sup>2</sup> By Mr. A. E. Housman, *C.R.* 1900, p. 467.

"*ἔσπερα* FOR before IN MODERN GREEK.—The following, as illustrating the confusion of past and future time in language, should be of interest to grammarians. In Calymnos (the usage is doubtless not confined to this island) the adverb *ἔσπερα*, 'after,' is commonly used as equivalent to *ἀρχίτερα*, 'before,' "*ἔσπερα τὸ 'καὶ* means 'he did it before'; but it also may mean 'he did it after.' The schools will take a long time to suppress this usage. It seems obvious

that *ἔσπερα*, thus used of past time, means 'after something that happened before, but before something that happened after.' So, although only an adverbial and not a verbal form, it might be designated as a strong *Plus quam Perfectum*. It is none the less most confusing to strangers.

W. R. PATON.

CALYMNOS,  
Dec. 2, 1900.

## REVIEWS AND COMPTES RENDUS.

### NESTLE'S EURIPIDES.

*Euripides, der Dichter der Griechischen Aufklärung.* Von WILHELM NESTLE. Stuttgart. Kohlhammer, 1901. Pp. xi. 593. 15 M.

THIS book deserves a welcome, and will be found useful, as well as interesting, even by those who may dissent from the general views of the author. Of these, I hasten to say, I am not one; so far as I personally am concerned, I have nothing to do but to express my thanks to Dr. Nestle for the attention which he has given to my essays and my pleasure in the extent of our agreement. I should be hard indeed to satisfy, if I were not pleased with his remarks upon the *Ion* (p. 74) or the *Iphigenia in Tauris* (p. 113), or felt any disposition to enter into controversy at this moment upon those points in which he would modify or reject my suggestions.

The purpose of his book is to present a systematic view of Euripides' opinions and feelings. The division adopted is naturally not that of the poet's works, but of subjects, *Theology, Physics, Psychology* and others, with subdivisions such as *The Family, The State*. It will not be disputed that in the case of Euripides such an attempt is legitimate and promising; that his works, although their dramatic form generally precludes the direct statement of the writer's mind, do, as a whole, suggest a conception of his personality; and that it is desirable, so far as it may be possible, to describe this conception exactly. Dr. Nestle's treatment is full; there are nearly 400 large pages in the main statement, besides copious notes and indices (not the least valuable part); but the arrangement is clear and the style agreeable, and though well adapted for reference, the book is a book to be read. The temptation, in such a task, is

to carry system too far, and to press into service what is not strictly evidence. That Dr. Nestle avoids this danger I will not assert; but those who may desire, for their own purposes, to rearrange or to abridge the material will at any rate find the ground prepared for them and the instruments ready to hand.

For obvious reasons, the author proceeds most safely where the nature of the case allows him to follow the poet's own division of matter, and to discuss, as a whole, an individual play. Special attention may be invited to the treatment of the *Suppliants* (p. 63), the *Helena* (p. 89), and the *Bacchae* (p. 75). Dr. Nestle is with those who think that this problematic drama is no 'palinode', and rightly protests against the Procrustean simplicity of expediting this, or any, explanation of it by the process of arbitrary excisions. According to him, it is in the parts of Tiresias and Cadmus that we see most of the poet's own attitude towards the Bacchic religion. His reasons, which have much weight, cannot fairly be abbreviated, but should be studied as he states them.

The conclusions, at which Dr. Nestle arrives, the general view of Euripides' opinions and manner of thinking, which he presents, appear to be just. But it is possible to feel doubts respecting a portion, and no small portion, of the evidence. In the phrase 'Euripides says', with which these pages abound, there is an ambiguity which must be kept in mind. To gather the opinions of a dramatist from his plays is a delicate operation. A sentiment or proposition expressed dramatically proves *prima facie* nothing about the views of the author, except indeed this, that he thought it such as by some person and in some circumstances might naturally be uttered. How far he



believed or approved it, may and often will be undiscoverable; it can be known, if at all, only by an investigation extending generally to the whole play, and sometimes beyond. Dr. Nestle (p. 212) protests, with natural warmth, when Aristophanes tears from its context the famous

ἡ γλῶσσ' ὁμόμοχ', ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνόματος

and insinuates that Euripides has spoken in favour of promise-breaking and mental reservation. The *Hippolytus*, since we happen to possess it, shows us that the insinuation is at best a pardonable joke. The doubt expressed by Hippolytus in the citation does not even refer to mental reservation at all. The case is that of a promise of secrecy, obtained by treachery, and used to cover the revelation of an intended crime; and the question is, whether in such a case the promiser can properly hold or be held to consequences which, to the knowledge of the promisee, he did not intend or contemplate. What is remarkable is not that Hippolytus perceives this doubt (he would be incredibly stupid if he did not), but that he instantly dismisses it, and actually sacrifices to his oath not merely his own life, but the dearest interests of others. He is a very fanatic of his word; and if any objection were to be made upon moral grounds to Euripides' picture of him, it must be that, in the sympathy invited by his fate, we are led to overlook the extravagance of his fidelity. Should not then Aristophanes here be a warning? If we attempt to extract something about the opinions of Euripides from the equally celebrated fragment of the *Æolus*

τί δ' αἰσχρὸν, ἢν μὴ τοῖς γε χρωμένοις δοκῇ;

and the jests and anecdotes attached to it (p. 46), how can we know that we are not going, or being led, as far astray as in the other case Aristophanes might have led us, if the *Hippolytus* had been lost? We cannot, it seems, be sure that we even understand exactly what was meant by the words; much less can we guess whether the dramatist approved or disapproved them, or implied no judgment at all.

The principle of the matter cannot be better illustrated than by the small group of passages (pp. 142 foll.) in which Euripides refers, or seems to refer, to the doctrines and practices known as 'Orphic'. In the *Cyclops* (646) the cowardly Satyrs excuse themselves from helping actively in the attack on Polyphemus, but sing at a safe distance 'a charm of Orpheus', which, they say 'will make the fire-brand go in of itself'.

Dr. Nestle infers that Euripides had little respect for such conjuring, and the inference, in view of the whole scene and the whole play, is perfectly fair. But when in the *Hippolytus* (952) Theseus, supposing his son to be a detected villain, refers indignantly and contemptuously to the fact that the son has practised and taught the Orphic asceticism of fasting, and warns those present to beware of such hypocrites, how does it appear that the practice itself is condemned, or, if it is, that the dramatist sided with Theseus and not with Hippolytus? Doubtless, as Dr. Nestle says, the subsequent exculpation of Hippolytus does not refute Theseus on this point. But where is the evidence on the other side? Surely the scene would be justified dramatically if, as a matter of fact, some virtuous people did favour the Orphic practices, and also some hypocrites, and if, in consequence, some other persons regarded the practices as at best equivocal. How then can we infer anything more? And if here, with the entire play to guide us, we may remain in doubt, still less can we build upon scraps from the *Polydus* and *Phrixus*, showing that, somewhere in those plays, some personages showed knowledge of the Orphic doctrine that 'death is the true life', and perhaps an inclination towards it. That Euripides knew or could imagine such persons, we hereby learn, but really this seems to be all.

Nor is the fragmentary state of our tradition about Euripides the only imperfection of it which must be kept in mind, if we are to go on solid ground; some of it comes through such channels, and in so questionable a form, that we dare not use it. For example, we are told by Pollux, that Euripides so far neglected the dramatic character of the chorus that 'in many plays' he made them speak simply for himself, as in the parabasis of comedy, and in the *Danae*, by a resulting inadvertence, actually made a chorus of women *masculine*.<sup>1</sup> Pollux moderately calls this 'not tragic'. He might properly have called it unintelligible, impracticable, and absurd. If there had been, what is quite conceivable, such a thing as a parabasis in tragedy, that would not have justified or explained at all the habit ascribed to Euripides. If it is truly so ascribed, the fact is of profound importance for the interpretation of his works, and above all, when we are looking in them for his opinions. It could not safely be limited to the chorus; it would imply in Euripides

<sup>1</sup> Pollux 4. 111; see the fragments of the *Danae* in Dindorf or Nauck.



a tendency, almost a theory, which must be reckoned with everywhere. Anything in such an author might be spoken not in character but 'as for the poet'; and indeed Dr. Nestle (p. 38), combining this allegation of Pollux with other observations, seems to infer something of the kind as a matter of principle, which, if justly founded, should and must affect our estimate throughout. But what about the fact? The reference to the *Danae* cannot be verified; but we have the *Hippolytus*, which is presumably one of the 'many plays' in view; for it exhibits the very same phenomenon (1102 foll.), a chorus which speaks sometimes as if masculine, though in its dramatic character it is feminine; and the fantastic hypothesis of Pollux, that the masculine is the gender of the poet himself, has been current both in ancient and modern times. But there at least no such fiction is necessary, or ought to be entertained. The play has, as every one knows, both a male and a female chorus; and the fact that the genders *alternate* between strophe and antistrophe invites, or rather imposes, the very simple explanation that the two choirs are here combined in responsion. The vagueness and carelessness of ancient play-books has left this distribution unmarked—and that is all.<sup>1</sup> Now how are we to know that Pollux, whose treatment of the topic is sufficient proof that he was not very well qualified to deal with it, did not make in the *Danae*, and in his other 'many plays' (if there were many), the same false inference which others have made, and he plainly would have made, about the *Hippolytus*? His dictum here has as little authority as reason, and should be simply set aside.

Still graver are the reasons for doubting the testimony of comedians, rhetoricians and scholiasts (p. 33), when they imply, or hint, or assert, that in Euripides' *Cretans* the dramatist adopted, as part of his story, the *μῆξις Πασιφάως πρὸς τὸν ταύρον*. Nothing in Euripides, so far as we know him directly, lends support to this prodigious statement, which, if true, must deeply affect our estimate of him and of Athenian tragedy in general. And one thing is demonstrable, that the tradition of ancient scholarship, in the shape in which it descends to us, is not a sufficient warranty for such a statement. The play in question dealt with the story of Pasiphae no doubt. But there were in the fifth century B.C. various conflicting views about this story. There were those who

repeated, with or without belief, the primitive legend. There were also those who said that the thing was a mere mistake, arising out of the fact that the name of a certain person happened to be *Tauros*. Which of these versions Euripides adopted in the *Cretans*, only his play itself, the whole play, could assure us; and further, to judge by other cases more or less parallel, the question, even if we had the play, could not (as none knows better than Dr. Nestle) be answered by using the text like a mythological dictionary. All probability favours the supposition that the version of Euripides was humanist; and as for the ancients who tell us the contrary, they say the same about an allusion to the same story in the *Hippolytus*, where nevertheless the legendary version is intolerable, and the humanist version not only admissible but imperative. It is enough to say that Phaedra, the Phaedra of the *Hippolytus*, draws a parallel between the story of her mother, Pasiphae, and her own.<sup>2</sup> Readers of the *scholia* to that play will easily suppose that the ancient critics did not come in sight of the question, any more than (for instance) they saw any defect in an 'argument' of the play, which, among many words, bestows not one upon Hippolytus' oath, though the plot is impossible and unintelligible without it.

It must, however, be fully recognised that Dr. Nestle is not only right (as I think) in his general conclusions, but often instructive and acute in treating a particular point of evidence. Thus he well points out in the *Herakles* (p. 106) how the fate, which descends upon the hero, is fitted, and apparently designed, to suggest doubts respecting the prudence of those who, immediately before, in the popular style, have been finding a 'divine judgment' in the fate which descends upon the villain. If the death of Lycus proves, as the chorus tells us, the truth of popular theology, what does the madness of Herakles prove? In raising this question Dr. Nestle is in the right; but does it not suggest some modification of what is said on p. 62 respecting the attitude of the dramatist towards such popular opinions, as expressed in some parts of the *Herakles* and elsewhere? And how, with such an

<sup>2</sup> *Hipp.* 337:

ΦΑ. ὦ τλήμων, οἶον, μήτερ, ἡρδσθης ἔρον.  
ΤΡ. ἔν' ἔσχε Ταύρου, τέκνον, ἢ τί φης τόδε;  
That Euripides meant Ταύρου (not ταύρου, cf. Palaeph. Incredib. 20, Plutarch *Theseus* 16) has been pointed out to me by Professor Murray, and, when pointed out, is plain enough.

<sup>1</sup> See the Introduction to my edition of Aeschylus *Agamemnon*, pp. 1, li.

example before us, can we safely determine in what relation to the opinions of the dramatist we should rank a detached passage from the *Bellerophon* (p. 130); or how can we presume (p. 167) that a certain chorus of the *Hippolytus* expresses feelings shared by the poet, since to the chorus of the *Herakles* he has assigned, as we have just seen, feelings which were not his own, and which he was rather disposed to blame? On certain subjects, for example on the nature of Chance (τύχη), the sphere of Chance in the world, and the relation of Chance to other things or powers, we find (and what else could we expect?) among the various personages of Euripides opinions and sentiments, which, as Dr. Nestle seems to admit (pp. 56, 57), cannot be reconciled. Should we not then be cautious how we select a doctrine for Euripides out of the propositions, perhaps less unmanageable but certainly discrepant, which persons of

different ages, ranks, sexes, characters (and many unknown to us) were made by him to utter in different circumstances (and many unknown to us) upon such provocative themes as Rhetoric, Woman, Heredity, or the political value of the middle classes?

But enough of reservations, especially since it is impossible here to represent the work adequately, or even to notice the most striking points. Such a point is the stress laid by Dr. Nestle on the connexion of thought between Euripides and Heraclitus. This and much else we must leave to the reader. To sum up, it appears that the author, if he does not always use the available evidence with discrimination, at all events knows it thoroughly, presents it fairly, divines not unreasonably much which cannot perhaps be proved, and traces correctly the fundamental lines.

A. W. VERRALL.

#### LEBRETON ON CICERO.

*Études sur la Langue et la Grammaire de Cicéron.* Par JULES LEBRETON, S.J., Docteur ès lettres. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie. 8vo. Pp. xxvii, 472.

THE *Études* of Father Lebreton furnish a good example of patient and scientific method, and supply contributions of real value towards a better knowledge of the language of Cicero. The ground has been apparently so thoroughly worked that it would seem quite superfluous to give any more attention to it. As Dr. Lebreton himself says: scholars are ready to believe that nothing can be found of interest except in the syntax of the Africans or of archaic writers. None the less there are not a few statements in even our latest and best authorities on classical Latin prose, which really will not bear careful examination, and not a few gaps which might be filled up. Dr. Lebreton has made it his aim in a series of investigations, not covering the whole field of vocabulary and syntax, but dealing with the most interesting points open to doubt, to verify or disprove by the most elaborate statistics and an array of quotations the generally accepted rules. As natural with a French scholar, he has taken as his standard authority for the orthodox doctrine either Riemann's *Syntaxe Latine* (as revised by Lejay) or Riemann-Goelzer's *Grammaire*

*Comparées*. But he has not neglected the views of any standard grammarian, with the rather surprising exception of Mr. Roby, and the Gildersleeve-Lodge manual.

The value of such an elaborate collection of facts depends upon three points: its exhaustiveness, its critical care, and the soundness of the interpretation regulating the admission or exclusion of instances. To test the first would be a task requiring hardly less time and patience than were needed by the compiler; but Father Lebreton has utilised the best monographs in French, in German, and in English, and has often added to them from his own reading; so that they may be regarded as probably for his purpose exhaustive.

As to the critical care, Dr. Lebreton takes pains in every case, as far as I have observed, to give the authority on which the disputed reading rests; and he has used the best critical editions of the several works, as well as Müller's text for his basis. The work of English scholars like Dr. Reid, Dr. Tyrrell, Dr. Sandys and others is recognised; but it is odd to find that Dr. Joseph Mayor's storehouse of learning in his edition of the *De Natura Deorum* is ignored. Sorof, too, would have been of more use than Piderit for his object in the *De Oratore*. As to the interpretation, it is very noteworthy how many passages have been often cited as

examples of a rule, which when rightly translated are seen to have nothing to do with it—cases, *e.g.*, where a hypothetical subjunctive has been discovered, which is one due solely to reported speech. Father Lebreton has removed not a few of them; it might be too much to say that he leaves none; but at any rate they are very rare. One can usually follow his classification with complete confidence.

To give any adequate conception of the range of the *Études* it would be necessary to transcribe the full *Table Analytique des Matières* which covers pp. 467–471. The matter is divided into seven chapters on Concord, the Substantive, the Pronoun, the Verb (its transitive force), the Verb (tenses), the Verb (moods) and the Preposition and the Conjunction.

In the first the two sections deal with the concord of a verb or an attribute referring to several subjects, and with the attraction of a relative or a demonstrative. In the former the investigation is based upon the extensive material collected by Anz; but his conclusions are somewhat modified, and new canons of usage laid down. In the second the object is to reinforce the conclusions reached by Riemann in the *Mélanges Rénier* from a comparatively small number of instances, and to show from a wider induction that attraction is more common than the reverse, even in negative sentences. The rule to the contrary given by grammarians before Riemann rests upon a single corrupt passage in *Sest. Rosc.* 37, 106. Yet Gildersleeve-Lodge, § 211, R. 5, still says, that 'in negative sentences . . . there is no change,' quoting an instance from Vergil. The chapter on abstract substantives contains full collections, and some interesting remarks, but hardly any novelties, though there are some sound interpretations of disputed passages. The next section shows how much too strict stylists have often been in refusing to Cicero the use of the name of a country or a town to denote its inhabitants; there are numerous examples which it would be easy to multiply. The next deals with the collective singular, which is shown to be comparatively rare in Cicero, as compared with Caesar or Livy, but not by any means unexampled. Under the head of 'expressions employed substantively,' Dr. Lebreton defends Dr. Sandys' interpretation of *Or.* 1, 4, as against Riemann's. Chapter III. begins with a discussion of the various ways of rendering 'that of'; which is followed by a section on the use of *nostrum* and *nostri*, etc.; and by one

in which Father Lebreton disputes Riemann's rule that when two relative clauses are connected by a copula, the second relative is most frequently replaced by a demonstrative. This is of course often the case in Cicero, though seemingly not in Caesar nor in Sallust; but the retention of the relative is still more common, although it has not been noticed so much, just because it is normal. A long and very thorough discussion of the uses of the relative follows, which results in the sensible conclusion that texts must be interpreted by the general sense of the passage, not by rigorous rules.

Under the head of the verb Dr. Lebreton deals first with transitive verbs used without an object, including in this category, like M. Bréal in his *Semantics*, verbs usually governing a genitive or a dative, and gives a pretty complete set of passages in which they occur. Another chapter treats of the employment of the tenses. The usage of the historical present is carefully analysed; but in the only instance which he quotes for its employment in subordination to a subjunctive (*in Verr.* ii. 2, 20, 50) *faciam* is surely future indicative. Kühner from whom the quotation is borrowed does not seem to misunderstand it.

In treating on the use of the present, especially after *si*, instead of the future, Dr. Lebreton seems to adduce a good deal of doubtful matter. He allows this usage when 'the subordinate clause is equivalent to the principal'; but in many cases it appears to denote an action already commenced, of which the result is still in the future; so that each tense retains its natural force; *quod si efficias, hortos habeo* = 'if you are carrying this out, I shall get the gardens.' Dr. Lebreton would explain 'to do this means to get me the gardens.' Still in view of the usage of the comedians it is impossible to deny altogether this anticipatory use of the present. On the imperative in *-to*, Dr. Lebreton goes with the general current of opinion since Riemann's article, (*cp. e.g.*, the later editions of Schmalz) and accepts a temporal force rather than one of mere emphasis. In the 'futur antérieur' he finds the indication of an aoristic rather than a perfect force, while recognising how they tend to pass into each other.

On the consecution of tenses Dr. Lebreton attacks the 'grievous inexactness' of the rules laid down by Riemann, especially as to 'absolute' and 'relative' time, at considerable length, but our limits do not permit a discussion of his views, which would need to be examined in much detail.

Under the head of the 'Mood of Prohibition' Dr. Lebreton naturally discusses the conclusions of Professor Elmer, to which he does not consider that the articles contributed to the *Classical Review* by Sir W. Geddes, added anything of value; and submits them to a severe criticism, following mostly the lines of Professor Bennett. He protests against the exclusion of the letters, as not representing the classical usage; and insists on the prohibitive force of the perfect subjunctive with *nec, nihil* and *nequidem*, examining the examples of these constructions. With regard to *ne* with the present subjunctive Dr. Lebreton holds that Professor Elmer is as lax in admitting cases, as he was severe in excluding them previously. There is an interesting collection of instances of the usage of *quaeso*, *à propos* of the much-discussed *Att. xiv.*, 1, 2, '*Tu, quaeso, quicquid novi (multa autem exspecto) scribere ne pigrescere*'; in which Dr. Postgate's view is duly noted, but not discussed. The conclusion is that in Cicero there are forty-three instances of the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions, and not one decisive instance of the present.

In dealing with the use of the moods in relative sentences, Dr. Lebreton adopts fully the negative results of Dittmar's criticism of Professor W. G. Hale's theories (cf. *C.R.*, for December 1898); but considers him to have failed completely in substituting for it his rival theory of the 'polemical' force of the subjunctive. The exegesis of the passages quoted in this part of his book seems to me particularly good. On *Pro Sest.* 67, 140, he is quite clear in his support of Dr. Reid's view as against Dr. Holden's.

In discussing the usage of *cum* 'equivalent,' much use is made of the investigations of Lattmann, which, however, deal more with the tense than with the mood. He definitely rejects the theory of grammarians who like Madvig allow the use of the subjunctive imperfect with an 'equivalent' *cum*. For *cum-tum* Dr. Lebreton accepts the refutation by Professor Hale of the rules laid

down by Hoffmann and widely current, but rejected now by Schmalz in his third edition. He acutely notices that if Riemann was right in supposing *cum* in such cases to be co-ordinating rather than subordinating, the *cum* clause ought to go into the infinitive in reported speech, whereas it is always in the subjunctive.

There is a good discussion of the subjunctive in conditional sentences; but it does not take us much farther than the view stated so clearly by Mr. Roby, that the mental attitude may be shifted between the clauses of a hypothesis.

Several other points call for notice, such as the use of the infinitive with a relative, the omission of the subject of an infinitive, the use of the gerundive, the use of *ab* with passive verbs, and the attaching of *-que, -ne, -ve* to *ē*. But enough has been said to show the nature and variety of the topics treated. It may just be remarked that in the Introduction there is a caveat against an undue assumption of resemblances between Cicero's epistolary style and the diction of the Latin comedians. Dr. Lebreton points out, what no one has better indicated than Dr. Tyrrell, who is here criticised, that Cicero has not one, but a dozen epistolary styles; and that phrases natural in the letter to Lentulus, would be quite out of place in writing to Trebatius or Hirtius. Still it is clear that the Letters must not be left out of account in studying classical Latin prose.

Whatever may be thought of particular conclusions, Dr. Lebreton's studies show so much acuteness and diligence, and, so far as it has been possible to control them, so much accuracy, that all who have to do with the language of Cicero will do well to keep them within easy reach for frequent reference, facilitated as this is by very full indexes of subjects, of words, and of quotations. The last indeed almost amounts to a grammatical commentary on the whole works of Cicero.

A. S. WILKINS.

#### THE NEW MAXIMIANUS.

*The Elegies of Maximianus.* Edited by RICHARD WEBSTER, Classical Fellow of Princeton University. Princeton Press. 1900.

*Studio sulle Elegie di Massimiano.* GIARDELLI. Savona, 1899.

*Der Elegiker Maximianus.* VON PROF. DR. F. HEEGE. Blaubeuren, 1893.

THESE three works on the Elegies of Maximianus, all within the compass of eight years, and especially the first of them, open



again, but hardly solve, the points in dispute about the life, personality and date of the poet, his creed, and the relation of the MSS. to each other. Dr. Heege's programme is mainly occupied with the diction, syntax, and prosodial specialities of Maxim., and on these points is copious and erudite; it is perhaps somewhat excessive in demonstrating how closely the language of the Elegies is modelled on the classical period, though it is useful to be assured of this; and I may be allowed here once more to protest against the statistical record of the distribution of dactyls and spondee in the verses of the poet as not compensating the writer's labour by any corresponding utility.

The Savona professor's dissertation is divided into the following sections: 1. Morphology, including peculiarities in the comparison of adjectives, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions, particles. 2. Syntax. This section is very well done, and forms an excellent introduction to the Elegies. 3. Locution. 4. Metre; short, but dwelling on everything that can fairly be called salient. 5. Imitation. 6. A critical appendix treating many of the more difficult passages. I have read this with great interest, and can recommend Giardelli's lively and unpedantic style as likely to make the poems, themselves lively and natural, more read and studied.

These works, excellent so far as they go, are, however, in importance, not comparable with the elaborate edition of R. Webster. The volume, which is most beautifully printed at the Princeton Press, contains 128 octavo pages, of which the following is a short account. 1. Bibliography, giving a list of all the most recent dissertations, editions, or articles on Maxim. 2. Authorship. 3. Manuscripts. 4. Text of the Elegies with a full app. crit. 5. Critical Appendix mentioning most of the emendations which are of any importance. 6. Commentary. 7. Index.

Webster, remarking on the increasing unreality of Roman Elegy as exhibited from Tibullus to Ovid, on the fact that the Elegies are little more than variations on the theme 'old age,' exhibiting in a formalistic way the phrases of the erotic and consolatory Elegy, and the tendency to a rhetorical cast in the *motif* and manner, denies that they are autobiographic, and finds them to be not personal or historical, but a dramatic series of tableaux, in which the supposed hero Maximianus is merely a dramatic personage, not an actual and living poet. It is true that the MSS. seem to favour the view that

Maximianus is the name of the poet himself: e.g. Bodl.<sup>2</sup> after the poems has the words *explicit liber Maximiani*. But it must be observed that the Eton MS., which is acknowledged to be the best, has no heading or conclusion of the kind: that Bo<sup>1</sup> (Bodl. 38) ends with a mere *Finit*: while Reg. 15 A 7 has this colophon.

Talibus infecte deponis uerba senecte

Scriptus ab<sup>1</sup> auricamo maximiane lupu

in which the obviously corrupt *auricamo* may perhaps represent an original *eurimaco* or *eumachio*, if we may make such an inference from the form it bears in a marginal note in the Antwerp edition of 1567 *eumacho*, which with other marginalia was written by the younger P. Pithou, as he himself informs us: *contuli cum MS. Puteanorum fratrum Lutetiae MDCXI KAL SEP Petrus Pithoeus*.<sup>2</sup>

Again, it would be easy and natural to transfer the name which originally attached to the hero of El. iv. 26 to the poet himself, to say nothing of a mediaeval Maximianus of cent. XII, who wrote on old age, but of whom little is known.

As regards the date of the author, Webster, accepting the prevailing identification of Boetius in El. iii. with the philosopher of that name, and considering it improbable from the close resemblance to the *Consolatio* traceable in many passages, that the poems can be far removed from Boetius' death in 524 A.D., and on the other hand, pointing to the palpable imitations of Maxim. found in the Xth and XIth of the minor poems of Eugenius of Toledo, places them between 524 and the death year of Eugenius 657, yet so that they lie much nearer to the 6th than to the 7th century.

The arguments of Manitius in support of the poet being a Christian, Webster shows to be of an unsolid kind: we cannot argue from the uncertain attitude of the philosopher to the uncertain language of the poet. It is rather more probable that he was not a Christian. Heege, however, p. 6 note, calls attention to three passages which to me have a Christian ring. III. 83 *Salve sancta, inquam, semperque intacta maneto Virginitas: per me plena pudoris eris*: I. 218 *Terram qua genita est et reditura, uidet*: cf. Gen. iii. 19 *donec reuertaris in terram, de qua sumptus es*: V. 118 *Unius ut faciat corporis esse duo*: cf. Gen. II. 32 *et erunt duo in carne una*. And at any rate it

<sup>1</sup> al. arrepto.

<sup>2</sup> For this reference I am indebted to Prof. W. M. Lindsay.



cannot be said that the Elegies contain anything distinctly pagan.

The account of the MSS. has, I believe, nothing very new. Webster does not accept the primacy of the Eton MS. to the extent of Petschenig, who has made it the one basis of his text, a conclusion which has led him to some extravagant results, and which, in the bare form exhibited in his edition, cannot but shock the susceptibilities of most ears. My own re-examination of the earliest Bodleian MS. (Bodl. 38) only confirms the high opinion of it which I stated in 1884, and I have thought it worth while to add to this notice a complete collation of it. Here some typical specimens of its readings may be mentioned. Bo<sup>1</sup> = Bodl. 38. E = the Eton MS.

I. 177, 8.

Turpe *senum* uultus nitidi uestesque decorae  
Quis sine iamque ipsum uiuere turpe *senum*.  
E. has Turpes enim uultus—turpe sene.

201 Multa licet *nolis*. E. has *nobis* (wrongly).

205 nequiquam both Bo<sup>1</sup> and E: most MSS. have the inferior spelling nequicquam.

207 Plaudens Bo<sup>1</sup>: plaudens E.

223 Hinc est quod Bo<sup>1</sup>: Hic est quod E.

253 Mollia filtra thoris Bo<sup>1</sup>.

A most important reading. E, according to my collation (made in 1878) has *silera* or perhaps *filera*.

Bährens' G = Leid. Gronov. 87 also has *filtra*. The ordinary reading is *fulera*. But how can *fulera* be soft? The word implies solid wood or metal. There can be little doubt that *filtra* is the right word. Götz Thesaur. Glossar. Emendatarum, p. 199, s.v. *Centonem* writes "*Centones* ex multis pellibus uestes confectae, II. p. xiv. *filtra* V. 584, 5 *Papias* cf. *feltrum* apud Ducangium, *feltre* apud Osb. p. 117, 144." From these glosses *filtra* would seem to mean the soft material of a mattress. It remains an interesting question whether this word, which has a *prima facie* look of a later period than cent. vi. or vii., already existed then as an acknowledged Latin word. It appears to me indubitably right in the passage of Maxim., attested as it is by two such early guarantors as E (XIth cent.) and Bo<sup>1</sup> (perhaps XIIth cent.), see Madan's account of this MS. in his Summary Catalogue III. no. 8849.

266 Et sensus menbris his sepelire suis Bo<sup>1</sup>.  
hic E.

It would be rash to say what is *right* here: but the variant *sic* found in some MSS. would seem to be wrong. *Bis* seems possible.

272

Lentaque per senium Caspia tigris erit Bo<sup>1</sup>.  
aspera E.

I am afraid to follow Petschenig and Webster in accepting *aspera* on the evidence of E. This non-elision of *-um* at the end of the first half of a pentameter would be greatly against the careful rules of Maxim.'s metre; and not only is *caspia* attested by the early evidence of Bo<sup>1</sup>, but (if Webster's App. crit. may be trusted) is the reading of *all* the other MSS. Of those I have examined, I have found it also in the two Brit. Mus. codices, and in Bo<sup>2</sup>, where it assumes the form *capeida*.

I shall perhaps be doing the greatest service I can to students of these Elegies by appending a complete collation of Bo<sup>1</sup> with the text of Webster.

I. 59 moribus prouintia 61 mi *corrected to*  
mihi 65 uel ut ante petita 72 ponsus  
73 nāme 77 mihi *om* 80 Nec—nec 84  
honoris habet 85 machra 87 Si de-  
lectat 88 Nec cuiuslibet 90 propiis  
92 cyprus 93 cesaries 99 preciosius auro  
*margin.* l' aurum 100 Gemma est inditio  
111 Nunc quia (large capital) inutilis 113  
conditio 117 hui *altered to* heu 118 Tar-  
tareas uiuum 119 minor atque caligant  
122 expertam 125 con corpore 126 ad-  
stupet 130 aut rabiis 131 speties 136  
Et placerant (p *half smudged*) uncae scabrida  
menbra manus 137 fronte (r *half erased*)

143 ludisse senes necredere 150 sceptum  
154 Iam duplices aepulae 157 iam *om*  
160 abstineas 163 munia 165 oras 168  
quic quid 169 materie 177 senum 178  
senum 179 cumuiua 182 eris 183 Inmo  
186 apositis 196 ipsa 198 sapit esse  
putat 201 referret reuoluēs 205 nequ-  
quam 206 Nilque satis horret 208 ob-  
probriāo 209 Hee 210 petet 212 speties  
213 humeris 215 ipsa *om* 216 dimidii  
221 requirunt *om* 223 inconbens 225 gressu  
227 genteris (?) 228, 9 *om* 233 expen-  
dere 236 dura *om* 238 attracti 240 me  
putet 248 Telux qua 253 filtra toris 254  
habet 261 HISVENIENS in capitals honerata  
266 menbris his sepelire 267 hieu 269  
longeou 270 equus 272 Lentaque caspia  
273 consumet 277 figuram 279 qui posset  
281 sequuntur 282 Nec quicquam 284 me  
uocitare 285 gressus iam *om* 292 ruunt.

II. 1 liquoris 6 inbellem 7, 8 om 10  
 Ut spretus uitio iudicer esse meo 11 Hec  
 (H a large capital) 13 huic inquit hesi  
 (*Capital large and conspicuous*) 15 uomitu  
 et ceu 17 Et (largish capital) affers quis-  
 quam 25 Atque equidem 27 PRESTAT  
 ADHVC spetiosa 28 sedspicit *changed to*  
 despicit 33 Reliquias ueterum in niueis 34  
 Sed si quid 38 Nullus ad amplexus 39 solis  
 meritis omnia possunt luctus 40 Quodt  
 habuit 42 nota uiros 43 ERGO prae-  
 scientia 44 memoremur 45 fugiant 46  
 repellant 47 diligit 48 quaerat 49 can-  
 tet philomela 50 Sitque 52 Hospitia  
 petas 63 NECME addeo 64 En facio uersus  
 et mea dicta cano 68 Et quo pertendi 70  
 affectus 73 HIS After 74 follows EXPLICIT  
 LIB. I INCIPIT LIB. ScDs.

III. 1 NUNC *instead of* iuuentae *only the*  
*first f of a lost word remains.* The leaves  
 containing iii. 2-iv. 59 have been cut out of  
 the MS. It recommences with iv. 60 Et  
 quod non capiunt pectora bruta uolunt.  
 vi. 1 Missus (*large capital*) functus 4 blanda  
 nefanda 7 amori *rather than* amore 10  
 greco 13 afflictæ amanti 19 Illa syrenum  
 20 ulixis 21 quia cantus euincere molles  
 23 se lege 24 plausibus 26 colore 28  
 abstringens claudetret 29 Ad fractura  
 30 exausto 31 abstringere 33 tua sunt  
 me 36 uenit 42 semen 43 MVNERIS 47  
 sed adfuit 48 Munia grandæuo 51  
 infesta *but f over another letter, perhaps c*  
 (incesta) triumphum 52 increpitans debita  
 reddis ait 55 Erubui tunc et stupui  
 uerecundia motus 57 Contractare 60  
 focum 61 credelis 64 Hec 67 nonnūquā  
 carpere 68 tristitiam 71 TVNC 72  
 Effusus 73 hieque uitium crimenque

76 Vendicor 79 ipse 80 quo 81 Protinus  
 (*large P*) 81 argiuas 83 membri 87 MENTVLA  
 88 delitiae 96 Adstans 99 Nampe 100  
 nampe 103 funere 105 Haec 107 lang-  
 orem membri 109 ILLA 110 cahos 112  
 totum 115 geminans toto 116 duos 118  
 Hec 119 gemnia 120 fallat 121 secretaque  
 creta 122 fructiferumque caput 123 Vade  
 124 Et tibi 125 quod est ultra 133 risitque

134 placet 137 usus 138 Nonne quod  
 iuuenis est non amica malis 139 inpendunt  
 143 Tu post 147 potentia uictrix 148  
 sepes uoles 149 resumes 151 rediuiua  
 152 *erit but <sup>p</sup> was a later addition* 153  
 Conticuit (*a very large capital*) sotiata,

*but the a is in lighter ink and seems a later*  
*addition* 154 obsequiis

vi. 2 Namque et hoc 3 Sit 4 Con-  
 tractata 5 loeti 7 Ac 8 Hic 9 uolubile  
 11 corpore surgo FINIT

Mr. Webster's commentary is perfectly  
 original and new. It exhibits a large and  
 multifarious acquaintance not only with the  
 writers ordinarily drawn upon for quotation  
 or illustration, but, which is more to the  
 purpose, with the later writers of the time  
 which followed the adoption of Christianity  
 as the state religion; Ausonius, Avianus,  
 Prudentius, Orientius, Avitus, Boetius,  
 Corippus, Dracontius, Ennodius, Fortunatus,  
 Sedulius, and many others. The commentary  
 is particularly rich in quotations from the  
 Corpus of Latin Inscriptions, and will be  
 very attractive to those who make this  
 branch of literature their province. The  
 Anthologia Latina has also been utilised  
 not a little. In his judgments on the mean-  
 ing of the many disputed passages in Maxi-  
 mianus, Mr. Webster holds his own, and  
 his opinion comes with all the authority of  
 a learned and unbiassed scholar, who has ob-  
 viously made a *con amore* study of the Elegies.  
 I do not profess always to think he is right  
 and am sometimes disposed to hold to the  
 opinions I have expressed in the *American*  
*Journal of Philology*. But if he is com-  
 pared with the only previous commentator  
 known to me on the whole of the poems,  
 Wernsdorf, he will be found to be far his  
 superior in freshness of treatment, happiness  
 of illustration, and, if one may judge by the  
 great variety of works cited in the notes,  
 width of reading. His style too is attrac-  
 tive, recognisably American and German,  
 rather than English, in freedom and bold-  
 ness of tone.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

#### SWETE'S INTRODUCTION TO THE LXX.

*An Introduction to the Old Testament in*  
*Greek.* By H. B. SWETE, D.D., Hon.  
 Litt.D. (Dublin). With an Appendix  
 containing the letter of Aristeas edited  
 by H. St. J. THACKERAY, M.A. Pp. xi.

592. Price 7s. 6d. Cambridge Univer-  
 sity Press.

This well-filled volume affords an admirable  
 illustration of the scientific method as

applied to the study of one department of ancient literature. There is scarcely a superfluous word in the book; and everything is rigorously directed to the end in view, viz.: that of presenting the student of O. T. Greek with a concise account of the language, literature, and history of the Septuagint version. As a manual, it could hardly be bettered; and it places within our reach all the information needful in the way of general introduction to the Greek versions.

'A first attempt,' says Professor Swete in his preface, 'is necessarily beset with uncertainties.' One must, therefore, not expect finality in such an attempt; but students are to be congratulated on possessing in Dr. Swete's manual, as clear and trustworthy presentation of the most recent results of LXX criticism, as could well be imagined. The footnotes and references afford abundant proof (if such be needed) of Dr. Swete's consummate care in overhauling, and rendering conveniently accessible, 'all the published works dealing with the various branches of learning which fall within the range of the subject.' The literature is enormous; but hitherto students have not been able to focus the mass of varied information available on questions, critical, historical, and literary involved in any serious consideration of the Septuagint in particular, and of Hellenistic Greek in general.

Dr. Swete divides his work into three main divisions: (1) The history of the Greek O. T. and of its transmission; (2) The contents of the Alexandrian O. T.; (3) Literary use, value, and textual criticism of the Greek O. T. The fifth chapter—to signalize one out of many—dealing, as it does, with the MSS of the LXX, is particularly valuable; all the chief MSS are detailed, and the characteristics of each succinctly set before the reader. This is a great gain; but in a second edition of the book a few photographic specimens of the greater uncials and cursives might advantageously be given in the same fashion as has been done by Dr. E. B. Nestle in his recent 'Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the N. T.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> One might suggest, too, that, in a second edition, Dr. Swete should devote some paragraphs to discussing the functions of conjectural emendation in arriving at a true settlement of the LXX text.

In part ii. chap. 4, Dr. Swete has presented us with a useful collection of specimens of LXX Greek—all the more acceptable as no adequate treatment of the Greek idiom of the LXX exists at present. Some good hopes are held out by Dr. Swete that a Grammar of O. T. Greek will shortly be forthcoming; such a work will be of far-reaching importance.

Dr. Rutherford's remarks on the value of studying the Greek of the N. T. from the right point of view (see the preface to his recent translation of the *Romans*) have equally pertinent reference to the Greek of the LXX; nor is it one of the least satisfactory signs of the present that attention is being directed to the vast field, hitherto all but unexplored, of Hellenistic literature and idiom.

Equipped with Dr. Swete's manual edition of the LXX (already in a 2nd edition), Hatch and Redpath's Oxford Concordance, and with the present thoroughly sound and scientifically arranged Introduction, the reader of the Septuagint may feel that he has, at least, no lack of trustworthy subsidia in his study of LXX Greek. And such study will be amply repaid in an increasing knowledge, not only of the conditions under which the first great Greek version of the Jewish Scriptures was produced, but also of the many interesting problems opened up by a fuller acquaintance with Greek modes of thought and expression as a whole.

I have left myself scant space in which to call attention to Mr. St. J. Thackeray's critical edition of the Letter of Aristæas. Wendland and Mendelssohn's belated edition (which actually appeared just before Mr. Thackeray's) will possess, no doubt, an independent value of its own; but English scholars will not be slow to acknowledge the care and scrupulous accuracy which Mr. Thackeray has expended in rendering the Letter generally accessible; and his critical introduction (pp. 501-518) puts the reader in possession of the requisite material for understanding the condition of the text. The critical apparatus, at the foot of the page, if not absolutely complete, is sufficient for every practical purpose.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

Marlow, Bucks.

## GREGORIO'S GLOTTOLOGICAL STUDIES.

*Studi glottologici italiani.* Diretti da GIACOMO de GREGORIO. Vol II.<sup>1</sup> Turin, Loescher. 1901.

The publication of this volume gives us the opportunity of drawing the attention of English philological scholars to the excellent work that is being done at Palermo by Prof. de Gregorio and his pupils. He has founded there a school of linguistic science which bids fair to rival that of northern Italy. The contents of the second volume of its 'Studi' which has just appeared are worthy of the type and paper lavished upon them. They are distinguished by sound learning and scientific research, and though primarily confined to the Indo-European field include Papers on languages belonging to other families of speech.

The first article is an exhaustive examination by E. La Terza of the radical vowel in the theme of the Greek perfect, the results of which throw light on the general subject of primitive Indo-European vocalism. Other articles are upon the modern dialects or languages of Italy and the adjacent islands;

<sup>1</sup> The contents of the first volume were the following:—(1) G. de Gregorio, Contributi alla Etimologia e Lessicografia romana con speciale considerazione ai vernacoli siciliani; (2) R. Sabbadini, Saggio di toponomastica dell' isola dell' Elba; (3) M. La Via, Il vocalismo del dialetto gallo-italico di Nicosia in Sicilia; (4) M. Niedermann, Recensioni; (5) G. de Gregorio, Sopra un problema di sintassi comparata dialettale.

thus T. Zanardelli writes on Sardinian etymologies, M. La Via on the Gallo-italic dialect of Nicosia in Sicily, and the editor himself, Prof. de Gregorio, on various peculiarities of the Sicilian dialects. He also contributes an interesting article on words of Arabic origin in the dialect of the little island of Pantellaria, as well as an elaborate essay on the structure of the African language generally known as the Ewe. This he has studied from the lips of native speakers, the result being a monograph of the first importance to the students of African philology. He makes it clear that while Ewe is not a Bantu language, there nevertheless exist between it and the Bantu family certain similarities of structure which indicate contact or relationship of some sort in the past.

We must not forget to notice also a very interesting reference to the Basque which has been brought to light by R. Sabbadini. It is contained in a work, *De Rebus Hispaniae*, published by a Sicilian, Lucio Marineo, in 1535. Marineo passed the latter part of his life in Spain, and in his account of the Basques, gives us the earliest specimens of their vocabulary that have yet been discovered. It is noticeable that the forms of the words are practically the same as they are to-day, and among them is a list of the numerals.

A. H. SAYCE.

## CHROUST'S MONUMENTA PALAEOGRAPHICA.

*Monumenta Palaeographica: Denkmäler der Schreibkunst des Mittelalters.* Erste Abtheilung: Schrifttafeln in Lateinischer und Deutscher Sprache. In Verbindung mit Fachgenossen herausgegeben von Dr. Anton Chroust, Professor der Geschichte an der Universität Würzburg. Lieferungen I–IV. (München, Verlagsanstalt F. Bruckmann A.-G., 1900–1901).

A NEW palaeographical publication, which promises to be of considerable importance, has been undertaken by Messrs. Bruckmann of Munich, under the editorship of Dr. Chroust, Professor of History in the University of Würzburg. The four parts, comprising in all forty plates, which have already

appeared, form half of the first of three volumes, which, according to the prospectus, will be devoted to reproductions of Latin and German writing; while it is hoped in subsequent series to deal with Greek and Oriental palaeography. The form of publication is avowedly copied from that of the now dormant Palaeographical Society, which may claim to have been the pioneer in this department of study. As in that Society's volumes, the plates are accompanied by a transcript of the page reproduced and a brief description, embracing the history and palaeographical features of the manuscript from which it is taken. The plates are slightly larger than those of the Palaeographical Society, measuring  $22\frac{1}{2} \times 15\frac{1}{2}$

inches, so that even MSS. of considerable size can be reproduced without reduction. On the other hand the price is decidedly higher, twenty marks being charged for each part of ten plates, whereas the Palaeographical Society gave twenty plates for its annual guinea.

The quality of the plates leaves little to be desired, so that subscribers may be satisfied that they will have a handsome volume, as well as one that will be permanently valuable and instructive. Dr. Chroust's descriptions of the plates are admirably complete and careful, the history of the several MSS. being quite sufficiently set forth, while their palaeographical characteristics are fully and minutely indicated. Any student who works steadily through these descriptions, with the plates before him, will have only himself to blame if he has not gained a sound working knowledge of mediaeval Latin palaeography, within the limits adopted (for the present, at any rate) by the editor. The only suggestion which it seems necessary to make for the improvement of the publication on its material side is that the date and title (not merely the reference number) of each manuscript should be given on the plate itself, instead of having to be searched for in the description. In the practical use of such a volume this would save much time and trouble.

The range of the publication, as set forth in the prospectus, is as wide as possible, including all developments of Latin, and eventually of Greek and Oriental writing, both within and beyond the borders of Germany; but the parts actually issued show no traces of this broad field of view. The plates are drawn exclusively from manuscripts at Munich, either in the Staatsbibliothek or the Reichsarchiv; nearly all represent manuscripts written in Germany, and within a moderate distance from Munich, at Regensburg or Salzburg; and nearly a quarter of them are actually drawn from a single manuscript, a register of donations to the monastery of St. Emmeram, at Regensburg. To the student who is accustomed to the wide range of the Palaeographical Society and of similar publications, this limitation may seem strange; but it is deliberate, and with a reasonable object. The editor's intention is to illustrate the development of Latin minuscule script in one or two local schools from a single neighbourhood, so as to establish, if possible, the peculiarities of the local style; and since the manuscripts of Bavaria are readily ac-

cessible to him, it is natural that he should begin with them. Moreover, in devoting himself primarily to MSS. written in Germany, he is filling a gap in palaeographical knowledge. The more attractive MSS. of Italy and France have been reproduced and studied in considerable numbers, while the Palaeographical Society has naturally paid special attention to MSS. produced in England; but the German handwritings, which are artistically less attractive than those of their continental neighbours, have generally been left on one side.

Until Dr. Chroust has published examples from other German localities, it is too early to say whether a definite type of hand can be associated with Regensburg, as it is with Tours or St. Albans. The donation-registers of St. Emmeram afford good material to start upon, since they provide dated examples of writing from the scriptorium of that monastery from 822 to 1231. The hands are not remarkable for grace or beauty; indeed purely German MSS. rarely are so; but they form an instructive lesson in palaeographical evolution. The most beautiful of the MSS. reproduced in the four parts now under notice, though its connection with St. Emmeram's dates back to more than 1000 years ago, was not written there and cannot be reckoned to the credit of any German school; but, as Dr. Chroust acutely notices, it probably furnished a model for the scribes of the monastery. This is the famous Gospels of St. Emmeram, which forms one of the group of 'Golden Gospels' produced in the north of France during the reigns of Charlemagne and his successors. Written, probably at Corbie, for Charles the Bald in 870, and preserved at first at St. Denis, it had probably found its way to Regensburg before the end of the century, and there, about a hundred years later, Abbot Ramvold provided it with its superb golden binding. Its writing, like that of the Harley Golden Gospels in the British Museum and several other MSS. of the same group, is in splendid uncials of gold; while its ornamentation is of that gorgeous style which the artists of north-eastern France developed on the lines of their Anglo-Celtic prototypes. Of this luxurious volume Dr. Chroust gives four representations, one showing a magnificent page of illumination, while the others illustrate different parts of the text.

The only other highly decorated manuscript included in these four parts is the Gospels of Niedermünster, written between 1002 and 1025 either in the nunnery of that



name in Regensburg, or in the neighbouring monastery of St. Emmeram. The style of illumination is plainly modelled upon that of the French school above described, perhaps upon the St. Emmeram Gospel-book itself; but it is somewhat degenerate, and will not bear comparison for beauty with the work of the contemporary Winchester school in England. The writing is a rather large and heavy Caroline minuscule, with a tendency to lean forward, which also appears in other German MSS. of the same period.

The other plates are of purely palaeographical interest. They are spread fairly evenly over the minuscule period, except that the latest stages are only scantily represented. Seven of the MSS. reproduced belong to the 9th century, three to the 10th, eleven to the 11th, six to the 12th, six to the 13th, four to the 14th, and two to the 15th. Six of the plates represent charter hands, while one is a purely private hand, containing a draft letter written in the chancellery of Landshut in 1473; but the remainder consists of various kinds of book-hand, ranging from the year 818 to 1394. They do not, however, represent all the varieties of book-hand within that period.

The handsome style which we find in Bibles and chronicles of the 12th century, and the minute and compressed style of the Parisian Bibles of the 13th century, are not exemplified here. Rather we have the less formal writings of the monastic registers, with a few official documents from the courts of the Bavarian princes. Future parts will no doubt add more variety of style and place; but, considering how far the *general* field of palaeography is covered by existing publications, it is to be hoped that Dr. Chroust will, on the whole, adhere to the plan which he has so far followed, and will give us full materials for an adequate judgment on the development of writing in various parts of Germany. If, however, he wishes to go further afield, it may be worth while to suggest that the libraries of Russia have hardly been touched by the existing palaeographical repertories.

I may perhaps be allowed to comment from time to time on the future issues of this publication. For the present it must suffice to call attention to Dr. Chroust's enterprise, and to invite for it the consideration of librarians and students of mediaeval palaeography.

F. G. KENYON.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### PLATO, HIPPARCHUS 230 A.

MR. H. RICHARDS points out (*Platonica* iii, *C.R.* xv 301) that in the *Hipparchus*, 230 A, οὐτι πᾶν γε τοῦτί μοι ἀνάθου, a colon should be inserted after οὐτι πᾶν γε. So W. H. Thompson, *Journal of Philology* v (1874) p. 220: 'Ita edd. soloce. Distinguendum οὐτι πᾶν γε τοῦτί μοι ἀνάθου. Ad quae infra

respondet Socrates ἀνατίθεμαι τοίνυν σοι τοῦτο.' Thompson's notes were, he says, 'sent to Prof. Baiter of Zürich, who is preparing a new edition of his Plato': but I am not aware that Baiter's new edition has ever appeared.

H. J.

### ON EURIPIDES, HECUBA, LL. 1214-15.

Ἄλλ' ἦν' ἡμεῖς οὐκέτ' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει  
καπνῷ δ' ἐσήμεν' ἄστρ' πολέμιον ὑπο  
ζέον κατέκτας.

Mr. Marchant's suggestion<sup>1</sup> that πολέμιον ὑπο should be taken with οὐκέτ' ἐσμὲν ἐν φάει and not with καπνῷ δ' ἐσήμεν' ἄστρ' is

<sup>1</sup> *Cl. Rev.* (1901), p. 295.

surely neither necessary nor natural. I understand καπνῷ δ' ἐσήμεν' ἄστρ' to mean just what Aeschylus otherwise expresses when he writes, Ag. 815, καπνῷ δ' ἀλοῦσα νῦν ἔτ' εὖσημος πόλις. In other words, the point of the words may or may not be to indicate 'how Polymestor knew that the Trojans were lost,' but assuredly that in-

dication is not given directly by the words in question. The phrase *καπνῷ δ' ἐσήμην'* ἄστυ is complete in itself and involves no 'singular ellipse.' Cf. also the absolute use of *δηλῶ* in Soph. Antig. 471, *δηλοῖ τὸ γέννημ'*

ὡμὸν ἐξ ὡμοῦ πατρός | τῆς παιδός. The similar words, Aesch. Ag. 497 *σημανεῖ καπνῷ πυρός*, seem to me to support this interpretation.

A. W. MAIR.

#### CHARLES LAMB ALSO AMONG THE PROPHETS.

IN the twentieth volume (Berlin, Schwetschke, 1901) of the *Theologischer Jahresbericht*, p. 178, is a curious proof that bibliographical industry may cast its net too wide. Under the heading 'Israelitische Religionsgeschichte' I find: 'Lamb, C., Essays of

Elia. 2nd series. N.Y. Scribner (London, Macmillan).' I gladly bear witness to the general accuracy and astonishing diligence of the contributors to this serial, which stands at the head of its department.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

#### ARCHAEOLOGY.

##### THE TITULI ASIAE MINORIS.

THE appearance of the first volume of this splendid publication of the Vienna Academy marks a considerable advance in the series of *Corpora* of ancient inscriptions on which a whole army of epigraphists are engaged. It is edited by Prof. Ernst Kalinka, and contains the *Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti*, with the addition of two stray examples, one of Carian, the other of Aramaic—the only inscriptions of their kind from this part of the peninsula. The Corpus is to contain all inscriptions, in whatever ancient language, with the exception of the *Monumentum Ancyranum* and Diocletian's Edict; since these documents have already been well edited, and have no special local significance, they will not be included unless fresh circumstances make their revision necessary. We are to have the inscriptions of each site collected together, whatever their language—an arrangement which will considerably lighten the physical portion of the labours of historian and topographer. The first volume forms an exception to this rule, since the Greek inscriptions of Lycia are severed from the native ones, except in cases where the two languages figure on the same stone. The reason for making this exception is as excellent as it is obvious; the main object of the student of Lycian inscriptions at present is a philological one,

and what he requires more than anything else is a convenient collection of all known texts. The vast majority of Greek texts from these parts belong to a later date, and their inclusion would only hamper the 'Lyciologist.' Indeed, the honorary decree of the demos of Telmessus (No. 5) cut on a tomb already provided centuries before with a suitable sepulchral inscription, might very well have been excluded.

The recent publications of the Vienna Academy and the Austrian Archaeological Institute have taught us what to expect in the way of printing and illustration. In many of the epigraphic collections which we have to use, anything in the way of a facsimile comes like an oasis amid a desert of type. Here every inscription, where the original is not lost or inaccessible, is reproduced in facsimile, and there is a considerable use of blocks showing the construction of some of the more important inscribed monuments. A brief, but carefully written introduction, full indices (arranged both by initials and by terminals), and a revision of Kiepert's map by Dr. Rudolf Heberdey, make the equipment of the book admirably complete.

The introduction contains, among other things, a good summary of what we know about the Lycian accident—it does not fill two pages!—and an interesting paragraph on the ethnological relationship of the Lycians. The editor argues that nearly all

the sites which have produced Lycian inscriptions are either near the sea-coast, or in the comparatively broad Xanthus-valley; that the majority both of the names of these places and of the personal names occurring in the inscriptions are not of the forms characteristic of the indigenous Anatolian race; that the striking peculiarities of Lycian architecture are not found elsewhere in Asia Minor; that the same is true of the *Mutterrecht* characteristic of the Lycians. All which suggests that the Lycians are settlers who came by sea and mingled with the indigenous stock; and the Lycian language may be similarly a mixture of the two tongues. The theory is very attractive, but there is some difficulty in finding sufficient ground for a rigid distinction between Lycian and the language of the indigenous race, seeing how little we know of the former, and how very much less of the latter. Who shall say that *isūt* . . . (*Isinda*), *kadawāti* (*Kadyanda*), *telebehi* (*Telmessus*) are not properly Lycian names, but simply Lycian transliterations of indigenous names? The common noun *miñti* (*μνδῖς*) has also an indigenous sound about it. Yet, unless we mistake the argument, these are to be regarded as borrowed words. The argument from the position of Lycian sites is also attractive; a glance at the map on p. 10 shows how they are most thickly crowded round the good harbours. And although this habit of living near the sea is not necessarily confined to those who have in the first instance come over the sea, nevertheless there is good reason to believe in the transmarine origin of the Lycians. Tradition connects them with Crete; in Crete also there is a trace of the *Mutterrecht* which existed in Lycia. It would be difficult to find place-names in Crete which have a specially Lycian sound; but there are some, such as *Tylisus*, which suggest a connexion with the Anatolian stock. Further, if we look for architectural analogies to the Lycian style, we shall find something of the kind, however faint, in Mycenaean architecture. The architecture of the Lycians, with its extraordinarily faithful reproduction in stone of wood technique, shows how intensely conservative they were; probably therefore that *Mutterrecht* which they preserved was once more widely prevalent in Asia Minor; the dominance of the worship of the Mother-Goddess has often been remarked in this connexion. It seems, therefore, that the isolation of the Lycians may not have gone

back so far as at first sight one would expect. It is still tempting to suppose that Lycian is a relic of the original Anatolian tongue, which may have been spoken in Crete as well as in Asia Minor (although, it is true, the Praesian 'Eteocretan' inscription bears no apparent resemblance to Lycian). Many are the problems of which the solution waits on the decipherment of the Cretan clay tablets!

The most important of all the Lycian inscriptions is admittedly the great Xanthian stele (no. 44). We know that it deals with the history of the last third of the fifth century B.C.; this is especially clear since Benndorf published his remarkable study in the *Jahreshefte* (iii. p. 98 f.) of the Austrian Institute. The names of many of the dynasts mentioned are also known from coins. As regards the dates ascribed to the issues of most of these rulers, there is no serious discrepancy between the views published in the *Revue Numismatique* (1886, 1887) by the late J. P. Six, and those which I have adopted in the British Museum Catalogue of Coins (1897). All the dynasts but Kuprlli and Teththiweibi we agree in placing at the end of the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century. But while Six's approximate dates for these two series are 440-400 and 405-395 B.C., I have ventured to date them about 480-430 and 480-460 B.C. respectively. In the case of Kuprlli, however, I was able (Introd. p. xxxi.) to state that Six changed his view—a point which Prof. Kalinka seems to have missed. In the ten years following the publication of his article, a good deal of new material had been found, and in 1896 the distinguished Dutch numismatist held that the two series of coins—for there are two, and not one—reading Kuprlli were to be dated between 470 and 440 B.C. Now as to Teththiweibi. His staters, when Six wrote, were extremely rare; and it must be remembered that many specimens of his coins have that smooth surface, due to the use of worn dies, which obscures the style of so many Lycian coins. Further, the staters of Spñtaza, which closely resemble those of Teththiweibi, were unknown. Six's materials for dating these coins were insufficient. In publishing for the first time a stater of Spñtaza, and a new one of his elder (?) contemporary (*Num. Chron.* 1893 p. 15 f.) Mr. Warwick Wroth called attention to the difficulty of accepting so late a date as Six had proposed. No one who knows how willing Six was to appreciate new evidence will doubt that he would have

modified his date, had he had occasion to write on this subject. From this somewhat lengthy statement it follows that, by the numismatic evidence, the earlier Kuprli and the Teththiweibi of the coins cannot be contemporary with the Xanthian stele. But does it follow that, as Prof. Kalinka says, *si modo recte Hill hoc statuit, alius eiusdem nominis homo appellatur in titulo, alius in nummis?* Until we can satisfactorily translate the monument, it seems safer to suppose that the man of the inscription is the dynast of the coins, and is mentioned in connexion with the historic past, some account of which the inscription appears to give. This alternative is perhaps confirmed by the absence of Teththiweibi's contemporary Sp̄p̄taza from the inscription; had he been reigning at the time, a ruler whom his coins prove to have been so important would hardly have escaped notice; but if he was dead, only some connexion with the past history of the Xanthian princes would have led to the mention of his name.

This, however, is overmuch space to give to a small matter of criticism. Prof. Kalinka is heartily to be congratulated on the splendid beginning of a great work which it has been his good fortune to make. All Lycian students will be grateful to him, as much for the restraint he has exercised over himself, as for the care with which he has executed a task rendered peculiarly trying by the enigmatic nature of the language with which he has had to deal.

G. F. HILL.

*Journal international d'archéologie numismatique* (Athens), Vol. iii., Parts 3 and 4, 1900.

J. Rouvier. 'Numismatique des villes de la Phénicie.' Descriptive list of the coins of Aradus (continued) and Berytus.—E. Dutilh. 'Deux têtes ptolémaïques en marbre.' The heads are attributed to Ptolemy IV. Philopator and his wife Arsinoë III.—Dutilh. 'Un petit bronze inédit de Diospolis-Magna.'—Svoronos. *Περὶ τῶν εἰσκτηρίων τῶν ἀρχαίων*. Part iv. dealing with the leaden σὺμβολα.—Mowat. 'Bibliographie numismatique de l'Égypte grecque et romaine.'

Vol. iv., Part 1, 1901.

Svoronos. 'Die Polykletische Tholos in Epidauros.' Proposes to identify the Tholos (Paus. ii. 27, 3) with the circular temple, containing a figure of Hygieia, found on Epidaurian coins of Antoninus Pius.—A. Baldwin. 'A bronze coin of Bithynia.'—Rouvier. 'Numismatique des villes de la Phénicie' (continued).—O. Rossbach. 'Rhoimetalkes König des Bosphoros.' Marble bust at Athens, identified, by comparison with the coins, as Rhoimetalkes.—Svoronos. 'Finds of coins in Greece.' Chiefly of Macedonia, Histiaea, and Rhodes.

*Numismatic Chronicle*, Part iv. for 1900.

W. Wroth. 'Greek Coins acquired by the British Museum in 1900.' Describes specimens selected from the 915 Greek coins acquired by the Museum in the course of last year; with two Plates.—J. Maurice. 'Classification chronologique des émissions monétaires de l'atelier de Siscia pendant la période constantinienne.'—G. F. Hill. 'Bibliographical notes on Greek numismatics.'

*Revue Numismatique*, Part i. 1901.

Dieudonné. 'Monnaies grecques récemment acquises par le cabinet des médailles.'—Mowat. 'Le vase sacrificatoire des reines d'Égypte, symbole monétaire.'

Part ii. 1901.

Parazzoli. 'Essai sur l'origine des monnaies des nomes d'Égypte.' Dates (regnal years) occur on the nome-coins of the Emperors Domitian, Trajan, Hadrian, Ant. Pius and M. Aurelius Caesar. Mr. Poole (Cat. *Alexandria*) considered that these dates had no special significance, but Parazzoli points to the curious fact that dates on the coins of Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus occur at intervals of eighteen years. He thinks that the coins were struck when periodical remissions were made by the Emperors of debts due to the treasury. But this is no more than a conjecture. Parazzoli supports the usual view that the nome-coins were struck at Alexandria and not at the nomes themselves. There is another paper on the dates of the nome-coins by G. Dattari in the *Rivista italiana di num.*, Part ii., 1901.

*Revue belge de Numismatique*, Part iii., 1901.

J. N. Svoronos. 'Les monnaies de Ptolémée II. qui portent dates.' Svoronos claims to have made the important discovery that numerous coins of the Ptolemies are inscribed with dates which have been entirely overlooked by Poole and other numismatists who have attempted the classification of this difficult series. This discovery will be utilized by Svoronos in the arrangement of the corpus of Ptolemaic coins that he has now in preparation: meanwhile, he publishes a list of the dated coins of Ptolemy II., including a series on which dates had not previously been recognized.—M. C. Soutzo. 'Examen critique d'une nouvelle théorie de la monnaie romaine.' A criticism of the article 'Münzwesen (Rom)' by Dr. B. Pick in Conrad's 'Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften.'

WARWICK WROTH.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

**Revue de Philologie.** Vol. 25, 3. July 1901.

*Location du domaine sacré de Zeus Téménites* (Amorgos), J. Delamarre. A commentary and emendation of the text of this inser. first published by Weil in 1876. It is especially interesting for information on Greek farming. *Découverte d'un fragment de manuscrit d'Horace*, P. Sjöbeck. Discovered at Lund and contains Hor. Od. iii. 4. 12-65. It appears to be of the tenth century, and the commentary of the eleventh. *Les composés syntactiques et la loi de Porson dans le trimètre iambique des tragiques grecs*, G. Dottin. *Plaut.* Aul. 3-8, J. Chauvin. Suggests for 5 patri < suo > avoque iam heres qui nunc hic habet and for 7 thesaurum auri < anlam > clam omnis in medio foco, and inserts a new line after 5. *Tarentius*, Phormio, L. Havet. Various notes. *Ovide*, Met. ix. 557, R. Cahen. Keeps the reading of the archetype *tantum sit causa timendi* where vulg. is *tantum absit c.t.* and some edd. give *tamen ut sit c.t.* *A propos d'une édition récente de Thucydide*, D. Serrys. On Stuart Jones' edition which is called rather 'heureuse vulgarisation qu'un progrès considérable', but much merit in it is recognised. *Corrections au texte de Grégoire de Nazianze*, A. Misier.

**Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, etc.** Vol. 7. Part 2, 1901.

*Die Analyse als Grundlage der höheren Kritik* (continued), A. Gercke. In this part the writer treats of transpositions, changes of words and changes of sense, and then points out the advances in philology since the time of the Alexandrians. *Alkestisstudien* (concluded), L. Bloch. The *Alkestis* belongs, together with the *Peliades* and the *Medea*, to the Iolic-Thesalian circle of legends. By making the figure of Heracles subordinate to that of Alkestis the poet endeavoured to emphasize the more serious side of the material which had been hitherto treated as comic. This tragedy marks an important point in the history of the drama, having been produced, at a second representation in 438 B.C., to take the place of the usual satyric play as the fourth piece of a tetralogy. J. Ilberg notices the German edition of Mau's *Pompeji in Leben und Kunst* and the very useful book of P. Kabbadias, *Tò ieròn tou 'Asκληπιού ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ*.

## Part 3.

*Die inschriftliche Poesie der Römer*, J. Tolkiehn. With reference to Buecheler's edition of the *Carmina Latina epigraphica*. Most of them are naturally anonymous, being either of ritual contents or epitaphs, as well as inscriptions of honour and dedicatory, and finally the erotic street-poetry of Pompeii with numerous reminiscences of Vergil and Ovid. The inscriptions offer much that is of the vulgar speech and much that is arbitrary in metre. *Die Analyse als Grundlage der höheren Kritik* (concluded), A. Gercke. Interpolations, shorter or longer, are often connected by brackets and when these are removed the origin of the whole becomes clear. This leads to the consideration of the fundamental unity required in literary productions which, though often disturbed in the course of the work, is again restored. The rights of the free-creating poet and the limits of criticism are weighed against one another. W. Ruge reviews *Der Hannibalzug* of W. Osiander and F. Vogel contributes a favourable notice of Holmes' *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*.

**Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.** Vol. 46, 2. 1901.

*Vermuthungen zur Joucmenta-Inschrift*, R. Thurneysen. *Der Typhomnythus bei Pindar und Aeschylus*, A. v. Mess. P.V. 367-388 depends on Pindar *Pyth.* i. 15-23. For the narrative, which is lacking in Pindar, Hesiod is the source. In an appendix H. Usener shows a common source for both poets, viz. a Hesiodic poem which is quoted from Chrysippus by Galen in his work on the dogmas of Hippocrates and Plato. *Zur lex Manciana* (concluded), A. Schulten. *Βασιλεὺς Ἀρρίoxος Φαρίq*, L. Radermacher. This is the beginning of an edict quoted in Athen. 547 a. It was forged in the Jewish circles of Egypt in order to exhibit one of the Syrian Antiochi as a foe to learning. *Bemerkungen zu griechischen Historikern*, C. Wachsmuth. 1. Herodot in Thuriol. It cannot be proved that H. ever returned from Thuriol. 2. Alexanders Ephemeriden und Ptolemaios. 3. Das Alexanderbuch des Kallisthenes. The title of this was 'Ἀλεξάνδρου πράξεις'. *Der Anfang von Tacitus Historien*, O. Seeck. It is probable that T. has in his Histories continued Fabius Rusticus, not Cluvius Rufus. *Ein Bundesurkunde aus Argos*, M. Fränkel. Published by Boeckh C.I.G. 1118. *Die Antwerpener Handschrift des Sedulius*, C. Caesar. *Die Uebertieferung über Aspasia von Phokaia*, O. Neuhaus. The information upon the first part of her life goes back to Ktesias from whom Aelian derived it through Pamphila, Plutarch through Deinon, and Trogus-Justinus through Ephorus. *Zu Herodianos Technikos περί μορφῶν λέξεω*, P. Egenolf. *Notula grammatica*, G. Kroll. *Wörterweiterung*, H. Usener. A frequent source of error, as *propicius* for *propius*, *locutus* for *locus*, etc. *Bakchylides VIII. (IX.) 36 Bl.*, O. Hense. *Von zwei kleinen Leuten* (Papyrusschnitzel), S. Sudhaus. Berl. Urk. I<sup>o</sup> No. 229 and a duplicate No. 230; Grenfell and Hunt, Greek papyri II. 84. *Zu Ciceros Rosciana* § 11, G. Landgraf. Suggests *non dimissum iri*. *Zu Cicero*, H. Usener. *On de rep.* I. §§ 56, 69, II. § 4. *Chrysippos von Knidos und Erasistratos*, F. Susenmihl. *Schriftquellen und ihre Folgen*, C. Wachsmuth. Against A. Malinin's view of the situation of the Agora at Athens. *Wandel von l zu i im Italischen*, A. Zimmermann.

**Mnemosyne.** Vol. 29, 3. 1901.

*Homerica* (continued), J. van Leeuwen. On the house of Ulysses. *De Regia observatuncula*, J. J. Hartman. On Dio Cassius 54, 27 compared with Plin. Ep. iv. 11. *Ad Plutarchum*, J. J. H. On *Lyc.* 27 and 6. *Observationes criticae ad Lucianum* (continued), S. A. Naber. *Ad Tacitum*, J. J. H. In *Ann.* vi. 4 conjectures *posse se puerili modo moneri*. *Ad titulos Aeraephienses*, H. van Gelder. On the inscriptions published by Perdrizet in the *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique*. *Ad Plutarchum*, J. J. H. In *Lyc.* 14 suggests *πόνορος* for *τόκορος*. *Decorum coronae*, S. A. Naber. On the Indian fable of the loves of Nalus and Damayantis compared with Heliod. *Aethiop.* p. 278 ed. Didot. *Observationes criticae ad Dionysii Halicarnassensis Antiq. Romanas*, S. A. Naber.

**Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie.** 1901.

26 June. O. Puchstein, *Die griechische Bühne* (A. Körte), unfavourable. O. Girtl, *Due questioni*



*Lucretianae* (O. Weissenfels). M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*. II. 2. Vom Tode des Augustus bis zur Regierung Hadrians. 2. A. (F. Harder), very favourable.

3 July. P. Foucart, *Les grands mystères d'Eleusis* (H. Steuding). 'Essentially increases our knowledge.' *Ciceronis orationes*, vol. vi. Pro Milone, pro Marcello, pro Ligario, pro rege Deiotaro, Philippicae i.-xiv. rec. A. C. Clark (W. Hirschfelder), 'Shows knowledge and acumen.' E. Mueller, *De Posidonio Manili auctore*. I. (Breiter), favourable.

10 July. E. Wilsch, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Korinth* (A. Höck). 'Deserves our thanks.' *Corpus glossariorum latinorum* vi. 2, vii. 1. *Thesaurus glossarum emendatarum*, conf. G. Goetz, I. 2, II. 1 (P. Wessner). H. Menge, *Lateinische Synonymik*, 4. Aufl. (C. Stegmann), favourable.

17 July. O. z. E., *Von Asdod nach Ninive im Jahre 711 v. Chr.* (M.), unfavourable. O. Puchstein, *Die griechische Bühne* (A. Müller), favourable. C. Morawski, *Rhetorum Romanorum ampullae* (W. Gemoll). 'Too bold in conclusions.' A. Kunze, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Grammatik*. I. *Mea refert* (C. Stegmann).

24 July. O. Schrader, *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*. II. (O. Weise), favourable. A. Malinin, *Zwei Streitfragen der Topographie von Athen* (P. Weizsäcker). 'Does not produce conviction.' E. Badstübner, *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik der philosophischen Schriften Senecas* (W. Gemoll). 'Deserves to reach a wide circle of readers.' F. Stolz und H. Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*. Mit einem Anhang über lateinische Lexikographie von F. Heerdeggen. 3. Aufl. (Bartholomae), unfavourable.

7 Aug. R. Preiser, *Zum Torso von Belvedere* (P. Weizsäcker), very favourable. Sofocle, *Antigone* con note da Placido Cesareo (H. G.), favourable. *Le Liriche di Orazio*, da V. Ussani. II. (O. Weissenfels). 'Quite up to date and shows a thorough knowledge of Latin.' G. Némethy, *Adversaria*

*critica ad Taciti Agricolam, Annales, Historias* (Th. Opitz), favourable on the whole. Giov. Ferrara, *L'incendio di Roma e i primi cristiani*.

14 Aug. Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, iii. 1 (A. Höck), very favourable. G. Némethy, *Ad Verg. ecl. iv.* 47 (H. W.). A. Cima, *Appunti Oraziani* (W. H.). E. Badstübner, *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik der philosophischen Schriften Senecas* (O. Weissenfels), favourable. P. Weise, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des römischen Weinbaues in Gallien und an der Mosel* (W. Haag), favourable.

28 Aug. E. Rohde, *Kleine Schriften* (P. Stengel), 'We are thankful for what is here given us.' *Aristophanis Nubes*, ed. J. van Leeuwen (O. Kaehler), very favourable. W. Ahlberg, *De procleusmaticis iamborum trochaicorumque antiquae scenicae poesis Latinae* (H. G.), very favourable. *The elegies of Maximianus* by R. Webster (M. Manitius), very favourable. A. v. Cohausen und L. Jacobi, *Das Römerkastell Saalburg*, 5. A. von H. Jacobi (C. Koenen), favourable.

4 Sept. P. Guirand, *La main d'oeuvre industrielle dans l'ancienne Grèce* (F. Cauer), favourable. *Xenophontis opera*, rec. E. C. Marchant (W. Gemoll). Too conservative on the whole. G. Dittmann, *De Hygino Arati interprete* (H. Moeller), favourable. Tacitus, *Agricola und Germania*, by A. Gudeman (E. Wolff), favourable. F. Pradel, *De praepositionum in prisca latinitate vi atque usu* (H. Ziemer). Good as far as it goes but only extending to coram in alphabetical order.

11 Sept. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *The three literary letters*, ed. by W. R. Roberts (G. Ammon). 'Has much forwarded the study of the writer.' Ch. Johnson, *The notion of the voice in the theory of ancient music* (H. G.), favourable. *Actii Sermo xvi*, veröff. von Sk. Zervòs (Fuchs), favourable. W. Ahlberg, *De correptione iambica Plautina quaestiones* (H. Draheim), favourable. *Taciti Historiarum libri i-v*, ed. G. Némethy (Ed. Wolff), unfavourable.

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

*Aeschylus*. Schild. De responsione, quae in Aeschyli fabula Thebana inter binas nuntii regisque orationes intercedere creditur. 4to. 16 pp. Nordhausen.

*Ampelius*. Sorn (J.). Einige Bemerkungen zum 'Liber memorialis' des L. Ampelius. 8vo. 16 pp. Laibach.

*Antiphon*. Kohn (G.). Neue Antiphon-Studien. (Final part.) 8vo. 17 pp. Wien.

*Archilochos*. Jurenka (H.). Archilochos von Paros. Aus den Fragmenten dargestellt. 8vo. 15 pp.

*Aristoteles*. Schönermarck (C.). Die tragischen Affekte bei Aristoteles I. 4to. 28 pp. Liegnitz.

*Beyschlag* (F.). Die Anklage des Sokrates. Kritische Untersuchungen. 8vo. 58 pp. Neustadt.

*Bloch* (Leo). Alkestis-Studien. (Aus 'Neue Jahrbücher für das klass. Altertum.') 8vo. 52 pp., engravings, and 1 plate. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M.

*Brinckmeier*. Heinrich Schliemann und die Ausgrabungen auf Hissarlik. 4to. 32 pp. Burg.

*Caesar*. D'Ooge (B. L.). De particularum copulativarum apud Caesarem et Pseudo-Caesarianos scriptores usu. 8vo. 63 pp. Bonn.

— Müllinen (H. F. von) Divico oder die von Caesar den Ostgalliern und Südgermanen gegenüber vertretene Politik. Part III. 8vo. 44 pp. Bern. 90 Pf.

*Caesius Bassus*. Ernst (F.). Der Lyriker und der Metriker Caesius Bassus. 8vo. 38 pp. München.

*Cactani Lovatelli* (E.). Attraverso il mondo antico. 16mo. 350 pp. Roma. 6 lire.

*Capps* (E.). Studies in Greek Agonic Inscriptions. 8vo. 25 pp. Chicago.

*Carter* (J. B.). Selections from the Roman elegiac poets, with introduction and notes. 12mo. 330 pp. New York. \$1.40.

*Chatelain* (Aem.). Uncialis scriptura codicum latinorum novis exemplis illustrata. Folio. 60 facsimile plates, viii. pp. letterpress. Explanatio tabularum. 8vo. viii, 104 pp. Paris. Welter. £2.

- Church* (J. E.) Beitrag zur Sprache der lateinischen Grabinschriften. I. 8vo. 99 pp. München. Buchholz. 1 M. 60.
- Cicero*. Oratio Philippica secunda, with introduction and commentary by E. G. Sihler. 16mo. 157 pp. New York. 80 c.
- *Epistulae*. Vol. I. *Epistulae ad familiares*, ed. by L. C. Purser. Crown 8vo. Frowde. 6s.
- *Epistulae selectae temporum ordine selectae*, con note italiane da R. Carrozzari. 16mo. 144 pp. Milano. 1 lira 50 c.
- *De officiis liber primus*, with introduction and commentary by F. E. Rockwood. 16mo. 183 pp. New York. 90 c.
- Fifty letters, ed. for the use of schools by J. H. Dillard. 16mo. 13, 118 pp. Boston. Ginn. 45 c.
- Sander (J.) Bemerkungen zu den Cicero-Briefen. 4to. 28 pp. Wittenberg.
- Sternkopf (W.) Zu Ciceros Briefen. Cicero und Matus. 8vo. 21 pp. Dortmund.
- Wolff (J.) De clausulis Ciceronianis. 8vo. 34 pp. Breslau.
- Colluthos*. Ludwig (A.) Besserungsvorschläge zu Kolluthos. Kritische Miscellen (XXI bis XXIV). 4to. 20 pp. Königsberg.
- Cornelius Nepos*. Le vite degli eccellenti capitani, commentate da Riccardo Cai. 8vo. viii, 125 pp. Pistoia. 1 lira 50 c.
- Del Mar* (A.) Ancient Britain in the light of modern archaeological discoveries. 8vo. 24, 206 pp. New York. 82.
- Demosthenes*. The first three Philippics (in Greek) with introduction and notes by M. J. Smead. 12mo. 16, 220 pp. \$1.05.
- Heerdeggen (F.) Über parenthetische Sätze und Satzverbindungen in der Kranzrede des Demosthenes. 8vo. 26 pp. Leipzig.
- Meindlhummer (Fr.) Die Symmorieneinrichtung zur Zeit des Demosthenes und seine Reformvorschläge. 8vo. 35 pp. Horn.
- Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, rédigé par Ch. Daremberg et E. Saglio. Fasc. 30. (Lib—Lud). 4to. Double columns. Pp. 1205–1364, 183 engravings. Paris. Hachette. 5 fr.
- Dionis Cocceiani* (Cassii) historiarum romanarum quae supersunt, ed. U. Ph. Boissevin. Vol. III. Adiecta sunt specimina phototypica tria libri Vaticanani N. 1288. 8vo. xviii, 800 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 32 M.
- Dörpfeld* (Wilh.) Das südliche Stadthor von Pergamon. (Aus 'Abhandlungen der Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften.') 4to. 20 pp., 3 plates (1 coloured). Berlin, Reimer. 2 M. 50.
- Eichner* (M.) Warum lernen wir die alten Sprachen? 8vo. 103 pp. Bielefeld, Velhagen and K. 1 M.
- Ephorus*. Dopp (E.) Die geographischen Studien des Ephorus. I. Die Geographie des Westens. 8vo. 28 pp. Rostock.
- Euripides*. Medea, ed. by J. Thompson and T. R. Mills, with introduction, notes and translation. 8vo. 150 pp. (Univ. Tutor. Series.) Clive. 4s. 6d.
- Euripides*. Nestle (W.) Euripides der Dichter der griechischen Aufklärung. 8vo. xiii, 594 pp., portrait. Stuttgart. Kohlhammer. 15 M.
- Rappold (D.) Zum Euripidestext. 8vo. 22 pp. Wien.
- Evans* (A. J.) Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult and its Mediterranean relations, illustrated from recent Cretan finds. Imp. 8vo. 120 pp., 70 engravings and coloured plate. Macmillan. 6s. net.
- Galenus*. Helmreich (G.) Galenus de optima corporis constitutione. Idem de bono habitu. 8vo. 40 pp. Hof.
- Galzigna* (G. A.) Fino a che punto i commedianti del rinascimento abbiano imitato Plauto e Terenzio. II. 8vo. 40 pp. Capodistria.
- Girard* (P. F.) Histoire de l'organisation judiciaire des Romains. Part I.: Les six premiers siècles de Rome. 8vo. xxx, 341 pp. Paris. Rousseau. 15 fr.
- Glockner* (Steph.) Quaestiones rhetoricae. Historiae artis rhetoricae qualis fuerit aevo imperatorio capita selecta. (Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen Vol. VIII. Pt. 2.) 8vo. viii, 115 pp. Breslau. Marcus. 4 M. 80.
- Greek Inscriptions*. Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften. Vol. IV. Divis. II. Part II.: Meyer (H.) und K. Wendel, Wortregister zum 2. bis 6. Heft des II. Bandes. 8vo. vi. pp. and pp. 167–331. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck and R. 6 M. 60.
- Gusman* (Pierre) Pompeii, with a preface by Max Collignon. 8vo. New York. Dodd Mead. \$12.50.
- Hackel* (A.) Der Glücksumschwung im Hannibalschen Kriege. 8vo. 36 pp. Linz.
- Hall* (H. R.) Oldest civilisation of Greece: Studies of the Mycenaean Age. 8vo. 382 pp., plates. Nutt. 15s. net.
- Herzog* (R.) Das Heiligtum des Apollo in Halasarna. 8vo. 25 pp., map, plate.
- Hesiod*. Küneth (Chrn.) Der pseudohesiodische Heraklesschild, sprachlich-kritisch untersucht. I. 8vo. 41 pp. Erlangen. 1 M.
- Hirschfeld* (O.) Die Rangtitel der römischen Kaiserzeit. 8vo. 32 pp. Berlin.
- Hoch* (J. C.) and O. F. H. Bert. A new beginner's Latin Book. 12mo. vii, 242 pp. New York. \$1.
- Homer*. Odyssee, erklärt von J. U. Faesi. 9th Edition by A. Kaegi. Vol. I. (1–6). 8vo. xxx, 198 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 M. 10.
- Dühr, Homers Odyssee in niederdeutscher poetischer Uebersetzung. Buch xxiv. 4to. 15 pp. Nordhausen.
- Hoerenz (C.) De vetustiore versus heroici forma in Homeri carminibus inventa. 4to. 24 pp. Berlin.
- Ludwig (Art.) Textkritische Untersuchungen über die mythologischen Scholien zu Homer's Ilias. II. 4to. 24 pp. Königsberg. 50 Pf.
- Horatius*, erklärt von Ad. Kiessling. Vol. I. Oden und Epoden. 4th Edition; by R. Heinze. 8vo. viii, 466 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 M. 10.
- Fritzsche (Th.) Horatiana. De iisdem versibus

- et formis dicendi apud Horatium repetitis observationes grammaticae. 8vo. 17 pp. Güstrow.
- Skobielski (J.) Zu Horaz carm. II. 17, 21. 8vo. 6 pp. Czernowitz.
- Hoschek (Th.) Das römische Reich am Ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts nach Christus. 8vo. 17 pp. Pilsen.
- Huber (P.) Achaica. 8vo. 44 pp. Günzburg.
- Hula (Ed.) Römische Altertümer. 8vo. iv, 120 pp., map, engravings. Leipzig, Freytag. 2 M.
- Hyginus. Werth (A.) De Hygini fabularum indole. 8vo. 43 pp. M. Gladbach.
- Justinus Martyr. Lippelt (E.) Quae fuerint Justinus Martyris ἀπομνημονεύματα quaque ratione cum forma evangeliorum syro-latina cohaeserint. I. 8vo. 38 pp. Halle.
- Juvenal. Thiel (A.) Juvenalis graecissans sive de vocibus graecis apud Juvenalem. 8vo. x, 152 pp. Breslau. 4 M.
- Kalbfleisch (C.) Papyri Argenteratenses Graecae. 4to. 12 pp., 4 plates. Rostock.
- Karlowa (O.) Römische Rechtsgeschichte. Vol. II. Privatrecht und Civilprozess. Strafrecht und Strafprozess. Part III. 8vo. vi. pp. and pp. 945-1416. Leipzig, Veit. 14 M. 50.
- Karst (Jul.) Geschichte des hellenischen Zeitalters. Vol. I. Die Grundlagen des Hellenismus. 8vo. x, 433 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 12 M.
- Kotek (T.) Anklänge an Ciceros 'de natura deorum' bei Minucius Felix und Tertullian. 8vo. 60 pp. Wien.
- Lebentopulos (A.) 'H A'kal B'ἀπολογία ἐπὶ χριστιανῶν ἱουστινίου τοῦ Μάρτυρος καὶ δ'κατὰ Ἑλλήνων λόγος Ἀθανασίου τοῦ Μεγάλου. 8vo. 46 pp. Erlangen.
- Lommer (A.) Homeri ludos funebres quomodo recentiores epici Graeci et Latini imitati sint. 8vo. 54 pp. Straubing.
- Longinus. Tröger (G.) Der Sprachgebrauch in der pseudolonginianischen Schrift περὶ ὑψους und deren Stellung zum Atticismus. II. 8vo. 58 pp. Burghausen.
- Maass (E.) Analecta sacra et profana. 4to. 16 pp. Marburg.
- McCordle (J. W.) Ancient India as described in classical Literature: Collection of Greek and Latin Texts with translations and annotations. 8vo. 248 pp. Constable. 7s. 6d. net.
- Mair (G.) Die Aisten und Neuren und die Hyperboreer-Sage. 8vo. 53 pp. Pola.
- Malalas. Bourrier (H.) Ueber die Quellen der ersten vierzehn Bücher des Johannes Malalas. II. 8vo. 67 pp. Augsburg.
- Martianus Capella. Dick (A.) Die Wortformen bei Martianus Capella. Als Nachtrag zu Georges Lexicon der lateinischen Wortformen. 4to. 33 pp. St. Gallen.
- Maybaum. Der Zeuskult in Boeotien. 4to. 26 pp. Doberan.
- Mead (G. R. S.) Apollonius of Tyana, Philosopher, Reformer of First Century A.D. A critical Study with an Introduction on Religious Associations and Brotherhoods of the Times and possible Influence of Indian Thought on Greece. Royal 8vo. 164 pp. Theosophical Publ. Co. 3s. 6d. net.
- Meadler (C. L.) The Latin pronouns, is, hic, iste, ipse: a semasiological study. 12mo. 238 pp. New York. Macmillan. \$1 40 c.
- Medici Graeci. Fragmentensammlung der griechischen Aerzte, herausgegeben von M. Wellmann, Vol. I. Die Fragmente der sikelischen Aerzte Akron, Philistion, und des Diokles von Karystos. 8vo. viii, 524 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 10 M.
- Mesk (J.) Satz und Vers im elegischen Distichon der Griechen. 8vo. 13 pp. Brünn.
- Meyer (Wilh.) Der Gelegenheitsdichter Venantius Fortunatus. (Aus 'Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.' Vol. IV, No. V.) 4to. 140 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 9 M.
- Milliet (J. P.) La Dégénérescence bachique et la Nevrose religieuse dans l'antiquité. 8vo. 260 pp. Paris. 3 fr. 50 c.
- Minos (J.) Ein neuentdecktes Geheimschriftsystem der Alten. Mit Proben aus Nikander, Catull, Properz, Ovid, Vergil, Horaz, Phaedrus, Val. Flaccus, Martial und anderen und mit einem Nachwort über Akrostichisches bei den klassischen Dichtern der Griechen und Römer. 8vo. 64 pp. Leipzig.
- Moeller (J.) Studia Maniliana. 8vo. 51 pp. Marburg.
- Monumenta Pompeiana (To be completed in about 50 parts.) Part I. Folio. 3 Plates, two of which are coloured, 3 leaves of letterpress in Italian, French, German, and English. Naples. Each part 12 sh.
- Monumenti antichi pubblicati per cura della R. Accademia dei Lincei. Vol. IX. Part 3. (Cont. Patroni (G.) Caverna naturale con avanzi preistorici in provincia di Salerno. Brizio (E.) Il sepolcero gallico di Montefortino presso Arcevia). folio. pp. 546-807, 12 plates. Milan, Hoepli. 38 lire.
- the same. Vol. X. (Ghirardini (G.) La situla italica primitiva studiata specialmente in Este. Mariano (L.) Aufidena. Sogliano (A.) L'efebro in bronzo rinvenuto in Pompei.) folio, 654 pp., 26 plates. Milan, Hoepli. 85 lire.
- the same. Vol. XI. Fasc. I. (Pinza (G.) Monumenti primitivi della Sardegna.) folio. 284 pp., 19 plates. Milan, Hoepli. 43 lire.
- Ovid. Volkmann (W.) Eine Anmerkung zur Technik des Ovid. 4to. 18 pp. Breslau.
- Pischinger (A.) Der Vogelgesang bei den griechischen Dichtern des klassischen Altertums. Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung des Naturgefühls der antiken Poesie. 8vo. 108 pp. Eichstätt.
- Plato. Dialoghi, tradotti da R. Bonghi. Vol. VIII. Il Sofista o dell'Ente. Il Politico o del potere regio. Il Parmenide o delle idee. 16mo. 341 pp. Turin. Bocca. 5 lire.
- Kirchner (H.) Die verschiedenen Auffassungen des platonischen Dialogs Kratylus. IV. Gang und Gliederung des Dialogs. 4to. 20 pp. Brieg.
- Meiser (K.) Ueber Platons Euthyphron. 8vo. 37 pp. Regensburg.
- Schirlitz (K.) Der Beweis für die Identität

- der Tapferkeit und des Wissens in Platons Protagoras. 4to. 26 pp. Stargard i. P.
- Stählin (Fr.) Die Stellung der Poesie in der platonischen Philosophie. 8vo. iv, 68 pp. München. Beck. 2 M.
- Plautus*. Les Ménechmes, comédie, traduction en vers par P. Richard. 16mo. 79 pp. Paris. Delagrave.
- Koppenecker (H.) Zur plautinischen Metrik und Rhythmik. I. Teil. 8vo. 36 pp. Frankfurtal.
- Vahlen (J.) Accii poetae tragici indicium de Plauti fabulis. 4to. 26 pp. Berlin.
- Wollner (D.) Die auf das Kriegswesen bezüglichen Stellen bei Plautus und Terentius. Ein Beitrag zur Beurteilung des Plautus als Dichter. II. Teil, I. Abschnitt. 8vo. 100 pp. Landau.
- Plutarch*. Christ (W.) Plutarch's Dialog vom Daimonion des Sokrates. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.') 8vo. 52 pp. München. Franz.
- Polybius*. Amelung (R.) De Polybii enuntiatione finalibus. 8vo. 56 pp. Halle.
- Bender (Fr.) Antikes Völkerrecht (vornehmlich im Zeitalter des Polybios). 8vo. 86 pp. Bonn. Georgi. 1 M. 50.
- Posidonius Manilius*. Müller (E.) De Posidonio Manilio auctore. Spec. I. 8vo. 38 pp. Leipzig.
- Pradel* (Fr.) De praepositionum in prisca latinitate vi atque usu. 8vo. 40 pp. Breslau. 1901. 8vo.
- Prix* (Fr.) Bilder vom alten Rom. Begleitworte zu einer Reihe von Projectionsbildern. 8vo. 24 pp. Wien.
- Pseudocellius*. Zielewicz (J.) Prolegomena in Pseudocelli de universi natura libellum. 8vo. 38 pp. Breslau.
- Ramsauer* (F.) Die Alpen in der griechischen und römischen Litteratur. 8vo. 71 pp. Burghausen.
- Reichau* (H.) Die Entwicklung der Plastik bei den Griechen. 8vo. 37 pp. Magdeburg.
- Reinhart* (K.) Lateinische Satzlehre. 2nd ed. by J. Wulff. 8vo. xiv, 194 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 2 M. 40.
- Richter* (W.) Die Parodos und die Stasima in Sophokles' Trachinierinnen. 8vo. 112 pp. Schaffhausen.
- Roemer* (A.) Homerische Gestalten und Gestaltungen. 8vo. 20 pp. Leipzig.
- Sallust*. La guerra di Giugurta, riveduta e commentata da C. Tincani. 8vo. 235 pp. Milano. 1 lira 50.
- The conspiracy of Catiline as related by Sallust, rev. by J. B. Greenough and M. G. Daniell. 12mo. xi, 103 pp. Boston. Ginn. 97 c.
- Salomon* (G.) Die Venus von Milo und die mitgefundenen Hermen. 4to. iv, 36 pp., 4 plates. Stockholm. 8 sh.
- Schaefer* (Th.) Die Einwirkung des Volkes der Luceres und der Etrusker auf die Entstehung Roms. 4to. 35 pp., 1 plate. Bremen.
- Schreiber* (E. W.) Zum Texte der Historia Apollonii regis Tyri. 8vo. 49 pp. Korneburg.
- Schulze* (Guil.) Graeca latina. 8vo. 25 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck and R. 50 Pf.
- Seeds* (Mabel K.) Latin prose composition. 16mo. 103 pp. Columbus. 50 c.
- Seneca*. Rubin (Sal.) Die Ethik Seneca's in ihrem Verhältniss zur älteren und mittleren Stoa. 8vo. iii, 92. München. Beck. 2 M. 50.
- Solmsen* (Fel.) Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre. 8vo. ix, 322 pp. Strassburg. Trübner. 8 M.
- Sophocles*. Electra, with introduction by M. A. Bayfield. 12mo. Macmillan. 2s. 6d.
- Joachim (R.) Elektra von Sophocles in den Versmassen der Urschrift übersetzt. 8vo. 84 pp. Duisburg. 1901.
- Ortman. Zur Dramaturgie der Antigone des Sophokles. 4to. 16 pp. Torgau.
- Vicol (L.) Der Kunstcharakter des Sophokles hinsichtlich der Handlung und Charakterzeichnung. 8vo. 17 pp. Czernowitz.
- Vintscher (J.) Beiträge zur Würdigung des Sophokleischen Trauerspiels, 'Die Trachinierinnen' in Form einer übersichtlichen Einleitung. 8vo. 30 pp. Gmunden.
- Stieda* (L.) Anatomisch-archaeologische Studien. I. Über die ältesten bildlichen Darstellungen der Leber. II. Anatomisches über altitalienische Weihegeschenke (Donaria). 8vo. iv, 131 pp., 5 plates. Wiesbaden, Bergmann. 6 M.
- Strabo*. Hoefler (U.) Eine gemeinsame Quelle Strabons und des sog. Skymnos. 4to. 29 pp. Saarbrücken.
- Studies in Classical Philology*. Edited by a Committee of the University of Chicago. Vols. I, II. 12mo. 250 pp., 244 pp. Chicago. Each vol. \$1 50.
- Suetonius*. Ihm (M.) Richard Bentley's Suetonkritik. 8vo. 19 pp. Berlin.
- Tacitus*. Holub (J.) Tacitus Germania—ein Dialog. 8vo. 22 pp. Weidenau.
- Imendorffer (B.) Beiträge zur Quellenkunde der sechs letzten Bücher der Annalen des Tacitus. 8vo. 22 pp. Brünn.
- Tertullian*. Schelowsky (G.) Der Apologet Tertullianus in seinem Verhältnis zu der griechisch-römischen Philosophie. 8vo. 89 pp. Leipzig.
- Thringer* (E.) Latin Gradual. First Latin Construing Book for Beginners. New rev. ed. by W. Vale Bagshawe. 12mo. Uppingham. 2s.
- Treu* (M.) Matthaios Metropolit von Ephesos. Ueber sein Leben und seine Schriften. 8vo. 58 pp. Potsdam.
- Valerius Maximus*. Schnetz (J.) Ein Kritiker des Valerius Maximus. 8vo. 56 pp. Neuburg a. D.
- Virgil*. Aeneid. Book 4. With introduction, notes, vocabulary, test papers, and translation by A. H. Allcroft and A. E. W. Hazel. Crown 8vo. 128 pp. (Univ. Tutor. Series) Clive. 3s.
- Andergassen (L. B.) Zu Virgil's Georgica. 8vo. 14 pp. Rozen.
- Hoffmann, M. Der Codex Medicus pl. xxxix, No. 1 des Vergilius. II. 4to. 56 pp. Pforta.
- Ritter (R.) De Varrone Virgilii in narrandis

- urbium populorumque Italiae originibus auctore. Quaestio I.: De Timaei fabulis per Varronem Vergilio traditis. 8vo. 42 pp. Halle.
- Vogel* (Fr.) *Analecta*. I. Aus griechischen Schriftstellern. 8vo. 56 pp. Fürth.
- Wagner* (E.) Ein Besuch in dem Heiligtum des Asklepios zu Epidaurus. 8vo. 18 pp. Wehlau.
- Weinberger* (W.) Studien zu spätgriechischen Epikern. 8vo. 12 pp. Iglau.
- Weise* (P.) Beiträge zur Geschichte des römischen Weinbaues in Gallien und an der Mosel. 8vo. 38 pp. Hamburg, Herold. 2 M.
- Wiegandt* (Theod.) Zweiter vorläufiger Bericht über die von den Königl. Museen begonnenen Ausgrabungen in Milet. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften'). 8vo. 11 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf.
- Willers* (H.) Die römischen Bronzeimer von Hemmoor. Nebst Anhang über die römischen Silberbarren aus Dierstorf. 4to. vii, 251 pp., 82 engravings and 13 plates. Hanover, Hahn. 15 M.
- Winkelsaesser* (C.) De rebus divi Augusti auspiciis in Germania gestis quaestiones selectae. 8vo. 43 pp. Bonn.
- Xenophon*. *Expositio Cyri*, rec. Guil. Gemoll. Ed. minor. 12mo. viii, 266 pp., map. Leipzig, Teubner. 75 Pf.
- *Hipparchicus, sive de magistri equitum officio*, rec. P. Cerroahi. 8vo. 66 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 M.
- Gemoll (W.) *Schulwörterbuch zu Xenophon's Anabasis, Hellenika und Memorabilien*. 8vo. vii, 340 pp., engravings, plates, maps. Leipzig, Freytag. 4 M.